

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

FEBRUARY, 1946

No. 1



The Journal of Southern History

VOL. XII

FEBRUARY, 1946

No. 1

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK
University of Kentucky

WILLIAM B. HAMILTON
Duke University

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
University of Kentucky

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA
Rollins College

HENRY T. SHANKS
Birmingham-Southern College

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

HENRY L. SWINT, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership application and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XII

FEBRUARY, 1946

NUMBER 1



Copyright, 1946, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Democracy in the Old South.</i> By Fletcher M. Green	3
<i>The Furnishing and Supply System in Southern Agriculture since 1865.</i> By Thomas D. Clark	24
<i>Efforts at Crop Control in Seventeenth Century America.</i> By Theodore Saloutos	45
<i>A Confederate Newspaper in Mexico.</i> By Alfred J. Hanna	65
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> By James W. Patton	84
 <i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Mr. Jefferson Prepares an Itinerary. Edited by Elizabeth Cometti	89
Letters from a Southern Opponent of Sectionalism, September, 1860, to June, 1861. Edited by Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.	106
 <i>Book Reviews</i>	
Schlesinger, <i>The Age of Jackson</i> , by Culver H. Smith	123
Easterby, <i>The South Carolina Rice Plantation as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston</i> , by Fred C. Cole	126
Dickey, <i>Seargent S. Prentiss, Whig Orator of the Old South</i> , by John K. Bet- tersworth	129
Geiser, <i>Horticulture and Horticulturists in Early Texas</i> , by Rudolph L. Bie- sele	131
Ragan, <i>A History of Tusculum College, 1794-1944</i> , by Henry L. Swint	132
 <i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	134
Historical Societies	136
Bibliographical	139
 <i>Contributors</i>	 149

Democracy in the Old South

BY FLETCHER M. GREEN¹

The American dream of democracy and equality, based upon the philosophy of natural rights and popular sovereignty, found full, free, and adequate expression in such Revolutionary documents as the Declaration of Independence and the bills of rights of the state constitutions. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." "All power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; . . . magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them." "No man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the community but in consideration of publick services." These and similar expressions of democratic equalitarianism were familiar to the people in all the states of the American Union.

The mere declaration of these ideals did not insure their acceptance and enforcement; a vigorous and continuous defense of liberty is essential if it is to be preserved. Thomas Jefferson, spokesman for democracy, early observed that men were by their constitutions naturally divided into two classes: (1) those who fear and distrust the people and seek to draw all power into their own hands; and (2) those who have confidence in the people and consider the people the safest depository of public happiness and general well being. These two classes he called aristocrats and democrats. From the very beginning of American independence these two groups began a contest for control of the govern-

¹ This paper was prepared for presentation as the presidential address of the Southern Historical Association for 1945, but its delivery was prevented by the cancellation of the annual meeting.

ments. This contest between the forces of aristocracy and democracy was one of the most important issues in the political development of the American nation during the first half century of its existence. In the northern states it was fought between the commercial-financial aristocracy and the working men, in the southern states between the aristocratic slaveholding planters and the yeoman farmers.

The first state constitutions were framed in an atmosphere of equality and the recognition of human rights, without hint of race or class distinctions, but they established property and freehold qualifications for voting and office holding, and a system of representation, that gave control of the state governments to the wealthy, conservative, aristocratic classes. The power and influence of the aristocracy were further enhanced by the victory of the conservative group that established the Federal Constitution. The Jeffersonian democrats, accepting, in theory at least, the doctrines of natural rights, popular sovereignty, government by compact and contract, and the perfectability of mankind, began a militant assault upon the strongholds of aristocracy. They demanded and obtained a bill of rights to the Federal Constitution, and an extended suffrage and a greater equality of representation in the state governments. Under their attacks the powers of aristocracy were gradually whittled away. Finally, with the accession of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1829, it seemed that democracy would certainly triumph. Most American people agreed with Alexis de Tocqueville that the democratic revolution was an irresistible one, and that to attempt to check it "would be to resist the will of God."²

As democratic reform moved into high gear under Jackson its forces were divided by the emergence of the bitter sectional controversy over slavery. The northern abolitionists saw in the institution of slavery the absolute negation of liberty and equality and they began to weigh and to find wanting almost every feature of southern society. In particular they condemned the southern state governments, declaring that in them political democracy was being overthrown by a slaveholding aristocracy.

² Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Translated by Henry Reeve, 2 vols. (Fourth edition, New York, 1845), I, 1-2, 5.

This change, said they, was the result not of caprice or political accident but of deliberate design on the part of the aristocracy; and it was succeeding because "*the non-slave-holding people of the South lacked the enterprise, intelligence and daring to demand and extract their democratic rights.*"³ In other words, they held that the masses of free whites were incapable of understanding or maintaining their rights, and that the planter aristocracy was bitterly hostile to free institutions and the democratic theory of government universally.

By the time the sectional controversy reached the breaking point, the abolitionists had decided that the slaveholders had become a "DOMINANT CLASS, having positive control of the . . . political power of those States. . . . the system of slavery concentrating, as it does all political influence in a few men who are virtually absolute in their respective States."⁴ Contrasting the two sections, Richard Hildreth, the historian, declared: "The Northern States of the Union are unquestionable Democracies, and every day they are verging nearer and nearer towards the simple idea and theoretic perfection of that form of government. The Southern States of the Union, though certain democratic principles are to be found in their constitutions and their laws, are in no modern sense of the word entitled to the appellation of Democracies: They are Aristocracies; and aristocracies of the sternest and most odious kind."⁵

This interpretation of southern society and government was based upon moral hatred of Negro slavery, rather than a true knowledge of southern state governments or a philosophical or realistic understanding of democracy. Its appeal to the excited and hostile North was so powerful that most people accepted it as unquestionably accurate; and the general historians of the United States incorporated it into their writings. For instance, James Ford Rhodes says in his *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* that the "slaveholders, and the

³ Thomas S. Goodwin, *The Natural History of Secession; or, Despotism and Democracy at Necessary, Eternal, Exterminating War* (New York, 1865), 40-41.

⁴ Elhanan W. Reynolds, *The True Story of the Barons of the South; or, The Rationale of the American Conflict* (Boston, 1862), 34-35.

⁵ Richard Hildreth, *Despotism in America: An Inquiry into the Nature, Results, and Legal Basis of the Slave-Holding System of the United States* (Boston, 1854), 8.

members of that society which clustered round them, took the offices. . . . The political system of the South was an oligarchy under the republican form." And Lord Acton, the British historian and publicist, wrote that "Secession was an aristocratic rebellion against a democratic government."⁶

The abolitionist promoters of the theory of the aristocratic nature of southern governments never attempted to define just what they meant by either aristocracy or democracy. Indeed democracy has always been difficult of definition. It is a relative term, and has had various meanings among different peoples and for the same people at different stages of their political development. In this paper it will be used in its general sense as a form of government in which the sovereign power is held by the people and exercised through a system of representation in which the representatives are chosen by a fairly large electorate. The electorate has not been a fixed one in the United States. In the early days of the American republic the suffrage was bestowed upon adult male property owners; in the second quarter of the nineteenth century it was extended to all adult white males; during Reconstruction the Negro was given the ballot; and in 1920 women were permitted to vote in all elections. Recently, Georgia has given the ballot to youths eighteen years of age. No one would say that the state governments were undemocratic in 1850 simply because women did not vote; but they were *more* democratic in 1920 because women did vote. The same may be said in regard to Negro suffrage. Furthermore, up to the Civil War the emphasis on democracy was placed on *political* equality; since that time greater emphasis has been placed on social and economic equality. Modern thought presupposes that institutions, in order to be understood, must be seen in relation to the conditions of time, place, and thought in which they appear. It is difficult to look at democracy in this way, for one is prone to judge democracy of the past by the criteria of today. Yet the degree of democracy prevailing under the constitutions and governments of the Old South must be judged

⁶ See also, Hermann E. von Holst, *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States*, 8 vols. (Chicago, 1876-1892), I, 348-49.

by the democracy of that era, not of the present. George Sidney Camp was but speaking for his generation when he wrote in 1840 that democracy "is not of an agrarian character or spirit. Its immediate object is an equal division of political rights, not of property. . . . But republicanism does aim a death blow at all those laws and usages the object of which is . . . to give it a particular and exclusive direction as a means of political power."⁷

As noted above, the Revolutionary state constitutions utilized to a large degree the framework of colonial governments and constitutional practices of the colonial period which had recognized and established a governing class of the wealthy aristocracy. Only eight of the thirteen states made any change in suffrage requirements; and these changes did not abolish the principle that only property holders should vote, they merely reduced the amount of property required. Property and freehold qualifications for voting and office holding meant that the governing class in the southern states was in large measure a planter aristocracy. The system of representation also favored the planter group of the eastern section. Though democratic in form, these constitutions were certainly not democratic in fact. They did, however, lay the basis for the expansion of popular control, the chief element in a political democracy, to the majority of the people.

Hardly had the landed aristocracy established themselves in power when demands for revision and readjustment were heard in each of the states. Among the specific reforms called for were the disestablishment of the church and the abolition of religious qualifications for office holding; the abolition of the laws of entail and primogeniture; the broadening of the suffrage; the equalization of representation; and the reduction of property qualifications for office holding. All looked toward the curbing of the powers of the landed aristocracy. Piecemeal amendment and revision of the constitutions partially satisfied these demands.

In South Carolina the dissenting Presbyterians and Congregational-

⁷ George Sidney Camp, *Democracy* (New York, 1841), 155. Harper and Brothers were so anxious to spread the influence of this first general analysis of the principles of democracy by a native American that they brought it out in their Family Library.

ists, led by William Tennent, a Presbyterian minister, and Christopher Gadsden, prepared a memorial which was signed by thousands of people and presented a petition to the legislature in 1777 asking "free and equal privileges, both religious and civil" for all Protestants. Another group of reformers joined forces with the dissenters and demanded an elective upper house of the legislature rather than the appointive council. These changes were too democratic for the conservative and aristocratic element; but when the next elections showed a majority of the people favorable to the reform, and after the popular party had blocked an appropriation bill, the conservatives yielded. Even then Edward Rutledge and Arthur Middleton resigned the governorship rather than approve the changes. Maryland, too, modified her constitution in favor of Quakers, Mennonists, and other minor religious groups. Jefferson, Madison, and Richard Henry Lee succeeded in securing the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church in Virginia by legislative enactment.

South Carolina amended her constitution and joined Georgia and North Carolina in prohibiting entails and primogeniture. While no change was made in the Virginia constitution, the democratic element led by Jefferson forced measures through the legislature in 1786 abolishing entails and primogeniture. Jefferson believed that this legislation formed part of a system by which "every fibre would be eradicated of ancient or future aristocracy and a foundation laid for a government truly republican." The Virginia aristocracy never forgave him for this action.

The aristocracy made some slight concessions to the democrats in regard to suffrage and representation. South Carolina reduced the property requirements for voting from one hundred to fifty acres of land, and Georgia reduced it from ten pounds to the payment of all taxes levied by the state. Both states reduced considerably the property qualifications for office holding. And the up-country counties, inhabited largely by small farmers, were given a more nearly equal share of representation in the state legislatures. All efforts at change in these particulars failed in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. In spite of the concessions granted, the conservative aristocracy was

still in control of all five of the original southern states at the close of the eighteenth century.

The constitutions of the two new southern states added to the Union during this period of readjustment, Kentucky and Tennessee, show some influence of the frontier ideals of democracy. Kentucky gave the suffrage in 1792 to all free adult male citizens, but limited it to free white males in 1799. Representation was apportioned to free adult male inhabitants in 1792, and to qualified electors in 1799. No property or religious qualifications for office were prescribed, and the governor, after 1799, was to be elected by popular vote rather than indirectly by an electoral college as in 1792. Tennessee showed somewhat more aristocratic leanings in her constitution of 1796. Suffrage was limited to freemen possessed of a freehold; legislators and the governor were required to possess freeholds of two hundred and five hundred acres of land, respectively; representation was apportioned to the counties according to taxable inhabitants; and no person who denied the existence of God was eligible for any civil office. Though somewhat more democratic than the seaboard states, Tennessee nevertheless belongs with the group of older states controlled by the landed aristocracy. It should be pointed out, however, that in all these states there was much cheap land to be had; hence, it was no great burden to qualify for voting in any of these states.

The political revolution of 1800 which brought Jefferson and his party to power in most of the southern states, as well as in the federal government, led to the demand that the principles of the bills of rights be translated into realistic democracy rather than to stand as mere glittering generalities. In every state, democratic leaders condemned the discrimination made between those who had property and those who had none. They declared that where property had representation the people could not be free; and they were able to show that under the existing system of representation a minority of wealthy men of the east had absolute control of the state governments. They appealed to the philosophy of natural rights and demanded equality of political rights and privileges. This movement came largely from the small

farmer or yeoman class concentrated in the newer counties of the up-country or the western parts of the states; hence it took on something of the nature of an intrastate sectional fight. It naturally involved social and economic issues as well as political rights.

The rapid settlement of the piedmont and mountain region of these states in the first quarter of the nineteenth century gave to the up-country a majority of the white population. These small farmers had somewhat different interests from the low-country planters. They desired internal improvements—roads, canals, and railroads—at state expense, in order that they might have an economic outlet for their farm produce, cattle, and domestic manufactures. A supporter of reform predicted that if the westerners were given their way roads and canals would be built, domestic manufactures would increase, wealth would multiply, and that the “Old Families . . . imbecile and incorrigible,” would be replaced by a “happy, bold and intelligent middle class.”⁸ But the legislatures were controlled by the planter aristocracy of the east, who feared heavier taxation if the western farmers were given equal representation and resisted all change.

The yeoman farmers were joined by a small class of industrial laborers of the eastern cities. These people were smarting under the provisions of the constitutions that required a freehold for voting just as the yeoman farmers were smarting under the unequal system of representation. The laborers demanded manhood suffrage. The aristocratic planters feared to grant their demands lest the laborers join the small farmers in taxing the wealth of the east.

The democratic reformers demanded conventions fresh from the people with power to rewrite completely the constitutions. But since most of the constitutions left it to the legislature or made no provision for calling a constituent assembly, and since the aristocracy with their control over the legislatures could prevent a call through that body, the democrats were blocked at the very threshold of reform. The aristocratic minority fought doggedly to maintain its favored position, contesting every move of the democrats, and yielding only in the face

⁸ *Niles' Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), XXXVII (1829), 145.

of an open revolt. In Maryland they permitted a series of amendments between 1805 and 1810 that brought reorganization of the judicial system so as to bring justice closer to the people and make the courts more expeditious and less expensive. Property qualifications for officers were swept away; the suffrage was extended to adult white males, the written ballot was required, and the plural vote was abolished; and some minor officials were made elective. In South Carolina representation was reapportioned in the house on the basis of white inhabitants and taxes combined. By this method the large slaveholding districts and parishes lost some of their representatives as allotted under the earlier constitutions. Suffrage was extended to include all white adult males who had resided in the state two years and were possessed of a freehold of fifty acres or a town lot, or who, if possessed of neither, had lived six months in the election district. This in reality meant white manhood suffrage. A series of amendments in Georgia between 1808 and 1824 made all officers from constable to governor, including judges of all the courts, elective by popular vote. These changes looked toward a greater participation in governmental affairs by the people and made the governments more responsive to the public will but, except in South Carolina, they did not appease the democratic reform spirit. The conservatives had prevented any change in North Carolina and Virginia.

Four new southern states, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Missouri, were admitted to the Union during these years. Louisiana, admitted in 1812, fell to the control of the landed aristocracy. Only free white males were permitted to vote, and they were required to pay a state tax before qualifying. Members of the legislature and the governor were required to possess freeholds ranging in value from five hundred to five thousand dollars. Representation was apportioned according to qualified voters, or property holders. The governor and other officers were chosen by popular vote. Mississippi, too, was controlled by property holders. All officers were elected by popular vote; voting was limited to free white males who were enrolled in the militia or paid a tax; representation was based on white population; but mem-

bers of the legislature and the governor were required to possess land ranging from fifty to six hundred acres, or real estate ranging in value from five hundred to two thousand dollars. Alabama greatly broadened the base of political power. Suffrage was granted to all adult white male citizens; no property qualifications were required for state officials who were elected by popular vote; and representation was according to white inhabitants. Both Mississippi and Alabama declared that freemen only were possessed of equal rights. Missouri required no property qualifications for voting or office holding, though members of the legislature must pay taxes. Only whites could vote, and representation was based on free white male inhabitants.

Thwarted by the aristocratic minority in calling legitimate conventions, the democratic majority in the old states now threatened to take the matter in their own hands and call extra-legal conventions. Mass meetings were held in Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland; polls were conducted in various counties, all of which voted overwhelmingly for calling conventions; grand jury presentments called attention to the need for reform and recommended direct action if the legislatures failed to act; the voters in many counties instructed their representatives in the legislature to support a bill calling a constitutional convention; and hundreds of petitions went to the legislatures demanding relief. Typical of the sentiment for calling extra-legal conventions is the statement of a North Carolinian that if the legislature failed "to comply with the wishes of a great majority of the State," then "A convention will be assembled in the west, and the constitution amended without the concurrence of the east; and this being the act of a majority, and the legal act, will consequently be obligatory on the whole State. The constitution *will be amended*."⁹

A statewide reform convention assembled at Milledgeville, Georgia, on May 10, 1832, and issued a call for an election of delegates to a convention to meet at the capital in February, 1833, to alter, revise, or amend the constitution, or write a new one. It issued an address to the people in which it declared "that the people have an undoubted

⁹ Salisbury *Western Carolinian*, July 17, 1821.

right, in their sovereign capacity, to alter or change their form of government, whenever in their opinion it becomes too obnoxious or oppressive to be borne. That crisis . . . has arrived, when the people should assert their rights, and boldly and fearlessly maintain them.”¹⁰ The legislature now capitulated and called a convention to meet at the same time and place as that called extra-legally. Comparable action took place in Maryland in 1836, but the legislature passed a series of amendments similar to those proposed by the reform convention and forestalled extra-legal action. In like manner the legislatures of Virginia and North Carolina capitulated to the reform party, and submitted the question of a “Convention or No Convention” to the voters. In both states the call was adopted by large majorities. Mississippi and Tennessee, too, at the demand of the people, called conventions to revise their constitutions. This was one of the most signal victories for majority or popular rule in American history. In these states the people without political voice had, by threat of appeal to numerical majority action, forced the landed aristocracy who possessed the legitimate and constitutional political power to submit the fundamental law to the scrutiny and revision of delegates elected from the people for that purpose alone.

Democracy had won a victory over aristocracy. The people had compelled the wealthy planter class in control of the legislatures to call conventions to revise the fundamental law of the states. Majority rule had exerted its power and justified its right. One democratic spokesman declared that the freemen had united their forces “to break to pieces the trammels of aristocracy, and show to the enemies of republican equality that the sons of freemen will still be free.”¹¹

John C. Calhoun, Abel P. Upshur,¹² and other aristocratic leaders of the South openly denied the Jeffersonian ideal of equality of all men and bitterly condemned majority rule as the tyranny of king numbers; and they had their supporters in the North among such men as James

¹⁰ Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, May 31, 1832.

¹¹ Salisbury *Western Carolinian*, October 22, 1822.

¹² *Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of Virginia* (Richmond, 1830), 68-71, and *passim*.

Kent, Joseph Story, and Orestes A. Brownson.¹³ The less famous and little known leaders of democracy just as boldly proclaimed the doctrine of political equality. The views of the former have been given much attention by the historian; those of the latter have been generally ignored. The significant thing about the controversy, however, is that the views of the latter prevailed. The bills of rights remained unchanged and the majority forced the aristocracy to grant all white men an equal voice in the state governments. Charles James Faulkner, spokesman for the Virginia democracy in 1850, said that nothing short of a radical and fundamental change in the structure of the state constitution "could satisfy the progressive aspirations of a people who felt that their energies were held in subjugation by artificial restraints of republican freedom and equality." And, after the Virginia convention of 1850 had adjourned, he declared: "Its results was one of the proudest triumphs of popular government which the records of history attest. A revolution as decided in its results as any of those which for the last century have deluged the monarchies of Europe with blood, passed off under the influence of the acknowledged principles of popular supremacy as quietly and tranquilly as the most ordinary county election."¹⁴

The reform movement begun about 1800 now bore fruit in numerous constitutional conventions,¹⁵ and these conventions rewrote the state constitutions in line with the ideals of Jacksonian democracy. Many writers have attributed the democratic reforms of the 1830's to the influence of the western frontier. A study of the movement in the southern states gives an emphatic denial to this assumption. The people of

¹³ For Brownson's opposition to majority rule, see his "Democracy and Liberty," in *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* (Washington, 1837-1859), XII (1843), 374-87, and his "Unpopular Government," *ibid.*, XII, 529-37.

¹⁴ *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, XLI (1858), 227-28.

¹⁵ Conventions were held in Virginia in 1829-1830, Mississippi in 1832, Georgia in 1833 and 1839, Tennessee in 1834, North Carolina in 1835, and an abortive or revolutionary one in Maryland in 1836. There is a close parallel in the action of the northern states. Beginning with Connecticut in 1818, Massachusetts, New York, Delaware, Vermont, and Pennsylvania, all held general constitutional conventions by the end of the 1830's; and in Rhode Island there was an unconstitutional convention in 1842 that went beyond the extra-legal action in the southern states.

the southern states were cognizant of what was going on in the West, but the demands for reform grew out of local conditions and would have arisen had there been no "New West" beyond the Appalachians. In fact, it would be more nearly accurate to say that many of the ideas and motives of Jacksonian democracy were southern in origin.

To what extent was aristocracy weakened and democracy strengthened by the work of the conventions of the 1830's? In the first place, property qualifications for voting were abolished in all southern states except Virginia and North Carolina, and with Louisiana still requiring the payment of taxes.¹⁶ The last of the religious restrictions were also abolished. In a similar manner property qualifications for office holding were wiped out except for South Carolina and Louisiana, and age and residence requirements were reduced. A large number of officers heretofore selected by the legislature or appointed by the governor were now elected by popular vote. These include civil and militia officers, justices of the peace, superior court judges, and governors in all the states except Virginia and South Carolina. Rotation in office was generally applied through short terms and restricted re-eligibility. Progress was also made in the equalization of representation. There was no uniformity in the states, however. Some used white population, some qualified voters, some federal population returns, and some a combination of population and taxation. Those states that had heretofore granted special borough representation abolished it.

In still another way these changes broadened the base of democracy. For the first time the people had been consulted as to the revision and amendment of their constitutions. The conventions were called directly or indirectly by action of the people. The revised constitutions were in turn submitted back to them for ratification or rejection. In at least one state the people twice rejected the changes, and forced the desired reforms through by legislative amendments. And the new constitutions provided for future amendment and revision.

¹⁶ Among northern states, New Jersey and Rhode Island retained property qualifications, and Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio retained the tax paying requirement.

In one matter there was a definite reactionary movement. This was the issue of free Negro suffrage. Virginia and North Carolina joined Maryland and Kentucky in taking from the free Negro the ballot he had heretofore possessed. In like manner all new states of the period, North as well as South, denied suffrage to free Negroes. The action of the old southern states was paralleled by that of the northern states. Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania took the ballot from the Negro. And New York in 1821 limited Negro suffrage by requiring that he possess a freehold valued at two hundred fifty dollars over and above all indebtedness. Hence only five of the northern states granted equal suffrage to Negroes. Whether or not Jefferson, Mason, and other Revolutionary proponents of natural rights philosophy intended to include Negroes in the statement that "all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights" is a debatable question;¹⁷ but in actual practice the American people had decided by their constitutional provisions that Negroes were not included in the *political people*. From the very day of the Declaration of Independence the race problem had caused the American people to make an exception to the doctrine that "all men are created equal." But the partial exclusion of the Negro from the promises of democracy did not impair the faith of the whites in those promises.

The influence of the democratic reforms of the Jacksonian period were far-reaching. Evidence of this is to be seen in many phases of southern life—social, intellectual, economic, and political. But the people were not satisfied with their partial victory, and the signs of progress only made them more determined to complete the democratization of their state governments. Their increased political power made the task of securing additional amendments and revision of their constitutions easier than had been that of calling the conventions of the 1830's. In the first case, they had threatened extra-legal action; in the second, they simply used the powers already possessed to put

¹⁷ Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2 vols. (New York, 1937), I, 82, state that "Jefferson did not mean to include slaves as men."

through additional reforms. This time they determined to take from the aristocratic class its last remnants of special political privileges. Important amendments in Georgia, Missouri, and North Carolina, and revision by convention in Louisiana, Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia,¹⁸ brought those states in line with the most democratic ones. Virginia in 1851 was the last state to provide for popular election of governor; and North Carolina in 1856 abolished the fifty-acre freehold required to vote for members of the state senate. The three new states, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas, all established complete equality of the whites in political affairs, and made all officials elective by popular vote. *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, analyzing the progress of constitutional reform in the nation, declared that the constitution of Louisiana showed "more political insight, and a more absolute reliance upon the principle upon which popular governments are based, than appears in the fundamental law of any other state in the Union." But the Missouri constitution "affords more efficient guarantees to individual rights, and leaves fewer opportunities for political corruption and for intercepting the fair expression of the wishes of the people" than that of any other state.

These changes left South Carolina the one remaining stronghold of the landed aristocracy in the South. While she had granted manhood suffrage in 1810, she continued to require her governor to possess a freehold until after the Civil War; the governor and presidential electors were chosen by the legislature; and representation was apportioned on a combination of white population and taxation. But among the northern states, Massachusetts continued to apportion representation in her senate on property until 1853; and Rhode Island continued to require voters and office holders to possess real estate valued at one hundred thirty-four dollars over and above all incumbrances, or with a rental value of seven dollars, until 1888.

The establishment of white manhood suffrage, the abolition of property qualifications for office holders, the election of all officers by popular vote, and the apportionment of representation on population rather

¹⁸ Louisiana in 1844 and 1852, Kentucky in 1849, and Maryland and Virginia in 1850.

than wealth, with periodic reapportionment, dealt a death blow to the political power of the landed, slaveholding aristocracy of the Old South. No longer could the members of that class dictate to the great majority of free white men. The aristocracy still had influence, as the wealthy merchant and industrialist of the northern states had influence, and as men of property in all times and places have influence, but they did not possess that influence because of special political privileges. Some southern planters possessed baronial wealth but this wealth no longer gave them political control. They constituted a social not a political aristocracy. "Such an aristocracy, although it may confer personal independence, cannot create political authority."¹⁹

If the landed aristocrat wished to sit in the seat of power and administer the affairs of state he must seek the support of the voter, his master. He must recognize every voter, however poor, as his political equal. And in the political hustings landlord and squatter, wealthy planter and poor white, did mingle as equals.²⁰

The political revolution also meant that large numbers of the small farmer and yeoman classes began to enter politics, and win seats in legislature, Congress, and the governor's office. The first governor chosen by popular vote in Virginia, in 1851, was Joseph Johnson, whose childhood had been spent in abject poverty without the opportunity for formal schooling. Despite these handicaps he had served in the legislature and Congress, beating some of the most wealthy men of his district.²¹ Indeed six of the eight men who served Virginia as governor in the years just prior to the Civil War came from the plain people; two began life as farm hands, one as a tailor, one as a mill hand, and another as a mail contractor. Henry County, Virginia, had the second highest percentage of large slaveholders in the state, yet only two justices of

¹⁹ Frederick Grimke, *Considerations upon the Nature and Tendency of Free Institutions* (Cincinnati, 1848), 311, 314; Camp, *Democracy*, 220-21.

²⁰ For descriptions of the equality of all classes at the polls, see Hamilton W. Pierson, *In the Bush; or, Old-Time Social, Political, and Religious Life in the Southwest* (New York, 1881), 131-46, and Lester B. Shippee (ed.), *Bishop Whipple's Southern Diary, 1843-1844* (Minneapolis, 1937), 22-23, 52.

²¹ "Joseph Johnson," in *Southern Historical Magazine* (Charleston, W. Va., 1892), I (1892), 185-87.

the peace, chosen between 1853 and 1858, possessed as many as ten slaves, while seven owned none and five owned only two each.²²

Few studies of southern leadership have been made, but preliminary investigations suggest that a majority of the political leaders of the Old South between 1830 and 1860 came from the plain people rather than from the large planter class. Many such men received aid from wealthy planters to secure their education, as did George McDuffie and Alexander H. Stephens. The literary societies at the University of North Carolina paid all expenses of one "penniless student" each year. Several of these students rose to high rank in the state, one becoming a United States senator.²³ Dozens of the men who rank at the very top in political leadership began as poor boys, and became planters and men of wealth by their own efforts. Let one of these men tell his own story. "When I was a boy—a very little boy—an honest but poor man settled (squatted is a better word) in a country where I yet reside. . . . Day by day he might have been seen following his plough, while his two sons plied the hoe. . . . The younger [of the sons] studies law and . . . was drawn into politics. He was elected to the State Legislature, to Congress, Judge of the Circuit Court, Governor of his State, to Congress again and again, but he never forgot that he was a squatter's son. He stands before you today."²⁴ Like Albert Gallatin Brown, many of the leaders of the Old South grew up on the frontier where free men could not and did not recognize any political superior. In fact much of the South was only one generation removed from frontier society in 1860. Aristocracy takes more time to establish itself than one generation.

One test of the effectiveness of democracy is the exercise of the suffrage by those qualified to vote. The southern states met this test to about the same degree that the northern states did. There was considerable variation from state to state in both the North and the South,

²² Gustavus W. Dyer, *Democracy in the South before the Civil War* (Nashville, 1905), 80-82.

²³ Kemp P. Battle, *Memories of an Old Time Tar Heel* (Chapel Hill, 1945), 93.

²⁴ Albert Gallatin Brown, *Speech of . . . in the House of Representatives* (Washington, 1852).

but the percentage of votes cast, according to the voting population, in the southern states exceeded that of the North as often, and to about the same degree, as it failed to reach it. For instance, in the presidential election of 1828, Georgia with a white population of 296,806 cast 18,790 votes and Connecticut with a white population of 289,603 cast 18,277 votes; Alabama, however, with a white population of 190,406 cast 19,076 votes. Thus the vote of Georgia and Connecticut was 6.3 per cent of the voting people, but that of Alabama was 10.1 per cent. In the same election, Massachusetts with 603,351 free people cast 35,855 votes; Virginia with 694,300 whites cast 38,853 votes; but Tennessee with only 535,746 whites cast 46,330 votes. The percentages of these states were 5.9, 5.5, and 8.2, respectively. In the presidential election of 1860, Georgia with a white population of 595,088 cast 106,365 votes; Connecticut with 406,147 white people cast 77,146 votes; and Alabama with 529,121 whites cast 90,307 votes. The percentages for the three states were 18.0, 16.7, and 17.0, respectively. In this election, Massachusetts had 1,231,066 free people and cast 169,175 votes; Virginia had 1,105,453 whites and cast 167,223 votes; and Tennessee with 834,082 whites cast 145,333 votes. The percentages were 13.7, 15.1, and 17.4, respectively. A comparison of all the southern with all the northern states shows a white population of 7,614,018 casting 1,260,509 votes and 18,736,849 people casting 3,369,134 votes, or a percentage of 16.6 for the South and 17.9 for the North. The western states gave the North the advantage in the over-all comparison. But if one uses adult white male population, which is more accurate for voting percentages, then the South had a percentage of 69.5 and the North of 69.7.²⁵

The vote of the southern states was almost equally divided between the Whig and the Democratic parties in the presidential elections from 1836 to 1852 inclusive. In the five elections the total popular vote of

²⁵ White population is used as a basis for all these calculations except that free population is used for the six states that permitted Negroes to vote. South Carolina is excluded, since the presidential electors of that state were chosen by the legislature. Population figures are taken from the United States Census reports; the votes from Thomas H. McKee, *The National Conventions and Platforms of All Political Parties, 1789-1900; Convention, Popular, and Electoral Vote* (Baltimore, 1900).

the Whig candidates was 1,745,884, that of the Democratic candidates was 1,760,452, or a majority for the Democrats of only 14,568. The Whigs had a majority in three elections, but in 1836 it was only 1,862 votes and its biggest majority was in 1840 with 52,851. The Democratic majority in 1844 was only 23,766, and in 1852, when the Whigs were weakened by the Compromise issue, it was 79,690. There was a total of twenty-seven states in the Whig column and thirty-seven in the Democratic column for the five elections, but except for the election of 1852 there was no overwhelming majority for either party; and in 1848 the parties divided the states equally. Such an equal division of party strength prevented any one group from dominating the political situation in the South. The states were shifting back and forth between the two parties so rapidly that no one could hope to retain power long enough to consolidate party, much less planter class, control. This situation also enabled the southern states to exert popular control over the United States senators who were elected by the state legislatures. With party changes in the states the senators were often instructed by the legislature how to vote on major issues in Congress. While the purpose of instruction was partisan it nevertheless resulted in the senators being made responsible to the majority will as expressed in state elections for many senators voted according to instructions and others resigned rather than do so.

With the coming of manhood suffrage came the demand for popular education so that the voter might cast a more intelligent ballot. It was recognized that democracy and republicanism could work effectively only with an educated electorate. Since "The chief object of constitutions and laws" is "to render its citizens secure in their lives, liberty and prosperity," the importance of "a good education to each individual, to every community, and to the State, cannot be too highly valued," declared a report of the Louisiana constitutional convention of 1844.²⁶ Popular education, wrote James M. Garnett of Virginia, "is of most importance in all governments. But it is indispensable in ours where all

²⁶ *Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of Louisiana, Which Assembled at the City of New Orleans, January 14, 1844* (New Orleans, 1845), 316-19.

political power emanates immediately from the people, who must be themselves both intelligent and virtuous, or it will rarely happen that their public functionaries will be any better than themselves."²⁷ Even the aristocratic element recognized the principle that they must now educate their masters, although many did not wish to support education by taxation. One of them declared "that in adopting universal suffrage, we took necessarily the consequences that would flow from it were any portion of the people ignorant and debased. . . . Without you enlighten the sources of political power, we shall have no government. . . . You have adopted the principle of universal suffrage, but the basis is public education."²⁸

Recognizing the need every southern state, with the exception of South Carolina where a system of poor schools existed, provided for the establishment of a public school system of education before 1860. North Carolina led off in 1839; the question had first been submitted to popular vote and carried by a large majority. In some states, Louisiana for instance, the constitution required the legislature to provide a state system and to support it by taxation. All the states except Virginia and South Carolina provided for a state superintendent of public instruction; in most states the superintendent was elected by popular vote. The systems of public education in the southern states, in provisions for administration, support, and general results, compare favorably with those in the northern states in 1860.²⁹

In like manner, popular control of southern state governments brought measures designed to minister to the economic wants of the people. In fact some leaders of democratic reform boldly proclaimed that this was one of the major purposes of government.³⁰ Boards of public works, popularly elected, were created to supervise internal improvements and to further the economic progress of the states. They

²⁷ James M. Garnett, "Popular Education," in *Southern Literary Messenger* (Richmond, 1834-1864), VII (1842), 115.

²⁸ *Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of Louisiana* (1844), 909.

²⁹ Edgar W. Knight, *The Influence of Reconstruction on Education in the South* (New York, 1913), 94, 98.

³⁰ See, for instance, Charles J. Faulkner, "Speech," in *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, XLI (1858), 218.

were interested also in the public utilization of the natural resources of the states. Imprisonment for debt was prohibited; banks were brought under state control; provision was made for chartering corporations; monopolies were prohibited; and provisions were made for uniform and equal taxation of property according to value. All these measures were included in the state constitutions. The states, too, safeguarded the rights and interests of the unfortunate classes. State asylums for the insane and schools for the deaf, the dumb, and the blind were established at state expense.

The history of the southern state constitutions and governments from 1776 to 1860 reveals a progressive expansion in the application of the doctrine of political equality. By 1860 the aristocratic planter class had been shorn of its special privileges and political power. It still gave tone and color to political life but it no longer dominated and controlled the political order. On the other hand, the great mass of the whites had been given more and more authority, and majority rule had been definitely established. The interpretation of the southern states as "political aristocracies of the sternest and most odious kind" had no basis in fact. With the exceptions already noted the southern state governments were as democratic in 1860 as their northern sister states. They had not attained the ideal goal of absolute equality, but in spirit and administration as well as in form they had progressively become more and more concerned with the rights and interest of the people.

The Furnishing and Supply System in Southern Agriculture since 1865

BY THOMAS D. CLARK

In the post-Civil War economy of the South the furnishing merchant was a key figure. He became the hub of the new system of agriculture, supplanting in many respects the factor of the earlier years. It was through his stores that goods were made available to customers on their home grounds, and it was he who facilitated the process of economic revival in the badly isolated regions of the South.

There were two big waves of store beginnings. The first came immediately after the close of the war, when high priced cotton, disruption of southern economy, and a general change in the distributive processes among the wholesale houses in the border and northern cities were influential in bringing about an organization of new stores. Southern boys coming home from the army, many enterprising Union soldiers, and a large number of Alsatian Jews saw in storekeeping a promising economic future.¹ The second was in the 1880's, when cotton and tobacco culture were climbing to new peaks of production;²

¹ Sidney Andrews, *The South since the War, as Shown by Fourteen Weeks of Travel and Observation in Georgia and the Carolinas* (Boston, 1866), 3-8, 338-42, 366; Robert Somers, *The Southern States since the War, 1870-1871* (London, 1871), 79, 240-44. The Henderson store at Miller's Ferry, Alabama, was established by a northern man; the Cohn Brothers store at Lorman, Mississippi, was founded by an Alsatian Jew, as was the Walther store at Gibson, Louisiana. Charles Fels went from a small mercantile business in Yanceyville, North Carolina, by way of Maryland, to organize the Fels Naphtha Company in Philadelphia. Before 1900 nearly every southern town had its Jewish store, and certain northern interests had established southern branches and independent stores.

² There were produced 2,269,316 bales of cotton, averaging 411 pounds, during the crop year 1865-1866. In 1873-1874, there were 4,170,388 bales, averaging 444 pounds; in 1887-1888, there were 7,046,833 bales, averaging 467 pounds; and in 1898-1899, the total production amounted to 11,274,840 bales, averaging 489 pounds. Latham, Alex-

and in the flurry of store organization during this period a majority of the more important stores were established.

Disorganization of the earlier supply system of the South brought about a new condition of trade which wholesale merchants were quick to sense and exploit. Instead of wasting energy on the restitution of the old factorage system of supply, they went to work to develop and expand the crossroads stores. They helped to locate desirable store sites, selected storekeepers, stocked the stores with goods, and supplied money and generous credit when it was needed. Actually they became stationary factors who used the southern merchant as a local intermediary for the distribution of a rapidly increasing quantity of goods. This was to be the merchant's most significant part in the building of the New South. Since there were few local banks, the local merchant was both a source of commodity supply to the people and a channel of capital outlet for extra-regional investors. It was he who served as a direct local contact man for the big wholesale mercantile houses, the fertilizer manufacturers, the meat packers, and the grain, feed, and cotton speculators. A special credit system which was devised by wholesale houses and manufacturers also tied the local merchant up with the nation's banking system.³

This system of farm supply and its method of credit-granting constituted a central theme for interpreting much of the history of the New South. Certain conceptions are regarded as standards in reaching an understanding of southern economy. Most of the observations and

ander and Company, *Cotton Movement and Fluctuations, 1898-1903* (New York, 1903), 107.

³ Every wholesale house carried its customers on a credit charge of 60, 90, 180 days, or longer. Notes given by merchants were discounted by wholesale houses to banks. A good example of this type of transaction was the negotiable paper accepted by the commercial fertilizer companies. For example of invoice systems of credit, see Invoice Book, J. C. Brown Store, Faunsdale, Alabama, 1885-1910 (University of Kentucky Library, Lexington); also, invoice files from Brice and Company, Woodward, South Carolina, 1890-1910 (University of Kentucky Library). Some stores paid their merchandise bills only once a year. Interview with Todd Jameson, Jameson Hardware Company, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, October 6, 1941. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, all store records hereinafter referred to are in the University of Kentucky Library.

comments center around the issues of credit-granting, rates of interest charged, and business techniques of the merchants.⁴

The most fundamental issue raised time after time in any discussion of the furnishing merchant's place in southern economy has been his method of doing business. Charges and countercharges have been made which accuse merchants of numerous bookkeeping abuses. No general statement of methods can apply to every aspect of the furnishing system. There were points of similarity in all methods of doing business, even where the particular details of recording accounts varied radically. Most often the larger merchants were able to employ business college graduates for bookkeepers, and they installed an elaborate system of accounting which consisted of daybooks, journals, ledgers, and invoice books. To this orthodox set of records was added an assortment of fertilizer, cotton, cottonseed, crosstie, and mill books for recording that part of the business which was not strictly mercantile in character. Some of the storekeepers used a simple self-devised style of entries while others used a more complicated double entry system.

From the customers' standpoint any system of bookkeeping, even the simplest single entry type, was beyond comprehension. They had no way of knowing whether merchants kept honest sets of books. Careful checking of numerous accounts reveals remarkably few errors, and such as have been found are minor slips in bookkeeping rather than intentional manipulation of accounts. These errors seem to have been made as often against the merchants themselves, as against the customers.⁵

⁴ Charles H. Otken, *The Ills of the South, or Related Causes Hostile to the General Prosperity of the Southern People* (New York, 1887), 12-53; Matthew B. Hammond, *The Cotton Industry; An Essay in American Economic History* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1897), 141-65. For local comment on the credit system, see *Columbiana (Ala.) Shelby Guide*, September 19, 1872. Tom Christian, Northport, Alabama, estimated on October 6, 1941, that over a long period of years the big Christian furnishing store conducted a credit business amounting to eighty per cent of its sales.

⁵ Accounts in the books of J. C. Brown, Faunsdale, Alabama, 1878-1918; John Jones, Black Hawk, Mississippi, 1879, 1883, 1891-1914; William Henderson, Miller's Ferry, Alabama, 1897-1916; T. G. Patrick and Company, Whiteoak, South Carolina, 1878-1920; Longshore's Store, Newberry County, South Carolina, 1870-1890, 1904, 1905, 1911; Calvin Brice and Company, Woodward, South Carolina, 1879-1915; W. D. Nixon, Mer-

Price ranges constitute a significant part of the furnishing story, but it is not an easy task to establish the prices paid for goods by southern farmers from 1865 to 1915. Seldom do written records reveal what grade or quality of merchandise was placed on the store shelves. This knowledge is necessary before unit retail prices can be established, and the margin of profit determined. Certainly prices were high as measured in terms of dollars and cents cost, but this is only a part of the absolute price factor of final value received. Goods sold over the counter of the southern general store were nearly all of the cheapest obtainable quality. Order notes, such as these random samples, indicate clearly the customer's lack of interest in quality. "Please let Jennie Gaines have a hat," a South Carolinian wrote T. G. Patrick, "he says you have one for seventy-five cents." Another wrote, "Please let Sam Moore have one pair of coarse cheap shoes & charge to Ike Yongue." Even orders for cheap molasses and biscuit crept into the notes. "Please send me six sacks corn, 50 lbs. cheap flour"; and "Please send me 2 gallons of cheap molasses."⁶

Nearly always, customers bought goods with the price uppermost in mind. Getting possession of the article was the primary motive, and eighty per cent of the order notes were written in the form of supplications. Merchants knew this, and they bought stock for their stores accordingly. Thus it is not always possible to establish price ranges on goods. It is true that wholesale prices are available in invoice books, and the sales prices are available in daybooks and journals, but there is often a long step between the entry of an article upon the books and the final payment for it. Sometimes payment was delayed as long as five years with a high interest charge accumulating all the while.⁷

rillton, Alabama, 1900-1912 (in the possession of Professor H. C. Nixon, Vanderbilt University).

⁶ Customers' Papers, T. G. Patrick and Company, Whiteoak, South Carolina, 1892. This type of record is common among merchants' papers. The following are also characteristic: "Please send me up to store 50# of sugar 75# of meat Rib if you have it and 50# of cheapest lard." M. W. Bell to D. W. Hopper, Faunsdale, Alabama, August 12, 1898, in J. C. Brown Papers. "Please send me a common pr half-fine shoes no 6 & charge to Jason Johnson for I. F. L. I told Dick Everson to get the meat I sent for yesterday." G. W. Spinks to J. C. Brown, October 21, 1893, *ibid*.

⁷ Every set of store records contains its list of cumulative accounts. For specific ex-

Goods were sold customarily at two prices. Cash prices were under those paid for goods charged on the books. Frequently notes came to merchants asking that no book charge be made on an order for goods with the promise to pay in cash within a week or two, and occasionally a landlord would request that his tenant be supplied goods at "high credit prices."⁸

The customer usually understood that he was paying a premium price for goods bought on credit, but he seldom had an accurate measure for determining the difference in price. There was, in fact, no universal rule for marking up the price of goods. Almost every writer on this subject has accepted a standard rate of twenty-five per cent, but without consulting merchants' books. Sometimes the mark-up price was more than twenty-five per cent, and frequently it was lower. Actually, the practice of "marking-up" goods appears to have been an individual matter, and was governed by personal factors known only to the merchant. Good credit risks were charged less, and poor ones more. To illustrate the mark-up principle on the basis of twenty-five per cent, a pair of alpaca pants costing \$4.00 in cash at protracted meeting time in July cost \$5.25 when paid for at cotton picking time in October.

Prices were carefully concealed from customers by a secret system of code marks. These were used in two or three line sequences to indicate cost, cash, and credit prices. Few customers could actually check first-hand the charges made against them, yet it was possible for the most illiterate customer to have a yearly account read to him and thereby to identify discrepancies in it by accounting for items purchased. His purchases for the year were so limited, and unusual articles were bought so seldom, that he could carry in his memory nearly everything that he bought, and could detect an addition at once.⁹

In many discussions of the general furnishing trade one significant examples, see the mortgage books of the J. C. Brown Store, 1901, 1904; and "Cold Accounts," William Henderson Ledgers, 1889, pp. 452-58, and 1893, pp. 495-98.

⁸ R. C. Phillips to D. W. Hopper, June 5, 1894, in J. C. Brown Papers; J. M. Gayden to T. G. Patrick, September 23, 1886, in Patrick Papers.

⁹ It is perhaps safe to say that a majority of the family accounts were under \$150, and a great many of them were under \$100. These accounts were divided into monthly installments.

detail has been overlooked. Even though customers were illiterate, and lacked facilities at times to check the accuracy of accounts, most of them held a potential club over merchants' heads in the system of using order notes and pass books for the purchase of goods. Once a lien note was signed and a customer was permitted to purchase goods at the rate of so many dollars per month, he proceeded either to issue on his own, or to have issued for him, orders against this allotment. The system of keeping track of such order notes varied with merchants. Some recorded the disposition of the note on its face, and after the books were posted strung them on wires by separate months in such a way that the first of the month always appeared on the bottom of the file. Others rolled their order notes into tight little bundles with the dates marked on the cover. Where pass books were used, they were held by the customer and were filled in by the merchant at the time purchases were made.¹⁰ By means of the order notes or pass book, therefore, it was possible to check every entry on a merchant's ledger, if the customer insisted at "settling up" time; and in the same way the merchant could prove that his entry was a legitimate one. Notes which appear in merchants' records, and corrections made inside ledger accounts indicate that they were checked. Sometimes disputes arose over charges made against customers and goods were brought in to settle the issue. On one occasion a landlord sent a Negro back to the store at settling up time to secure an adjustment in price on a pair of pants which he had worn almost beyond recognition.¹¹

¹⁰ Pass books occasionally crept back into merchants' files. See that of the Reverend R. G. Millen, 1880-1884, in Brice and Company Papers; also, D. C. Bennett farm accounts, Louisville, Mississippi, 1898-1918 (in author's possession). Occasionally an order note refers to a pass book, as in the following: "I wish you would pleas let West Davis have 800 dollar [eight dollars] if you pleas and charge to me if you pleas. I will Be up with my Book then you can put it on it." Edd Jackson to T. G. Patrick, April 4, 1883, in Patrick Papers.

¹¹ For examples of limits placed upon customers, see J. T. Stuart to T. G. Patrick, March 2, 1887, in which the landlord wrote: "Mr. Patrick please let Benjamin Richmond have a \$60.00 lien and take a morgige on all his crops and I will try and secure you." Another, Edward P. Moberly to T. G. Patrick, May 22, 1888: "You will have to let Aleck Robinson have three small hoes and take it off his monthly lean [*sic*] & shut down on all of them and only let them have bread & meat & corn They are buying what they can do without and trading it off no cloth or shoes at all I mean Every Renter." Characteristic of the

Merchandise was nearly always listed to merchants by wholesalers in three grade ranges. More often than not the bulk of the goods found in southern general stores was of the third or lowest priced grade. Especially was this true of clothing and foodstuff. Flour, for instance, was sold in three or four grades, and the margin of profit on the lower was boosted or reduced to suit the merchant. This factor in the pricing of goods involved the fundamental issue of competition. If the merchant controlled the credit of his customers then he likewise controlled his competition, and he could use the widest margin of profit. If, however, he did not have control of the customer's credit then he had to narrow his margin of profit for the purpose of meeting competition.¹²

In almost every way the mark-up in prices was actually a protective feature for the merchant. By this method of pricing, one customer was forced to pay for another's purchases. If all accounts had been paid in full, the mark-up practice would have become an enormous profit factor, but it is doubtful that this was generally true. Here again no universal rule was applied to the pricing of articles. Some items of stock yielded as high a return as 50 to 200 per cent while others were held as low as 10 to 20 per cent.¹³ Tacked on to these increased prices was

notes making arrangements for a lien is that from J. B. Patrick to T. G. Patrick (undated): "Let Calvin Williams have \$25.00 lean allow him to have five dol a month." For an insight into a settlement between a landlord and his tenant, see J. M. Gayden to T. G. Patrick, September 23, 1886: "In settling up with Bill he claims that he did not get but \$2.00 the 21st of August. I remember I sent back a due bill for \$1.75 given to Grant Boulware by W. M. P. & you credited me with 75 cts in trade for Bill. Look at your books and see if I am correct. Which due bill for \$1.75 & .75 chd. make \$2.50 he owe me. He claim that he got one shirt for \$1 pr. pants .75 & sundries .25 which make \$2. I told him to take pants back and see what kind of goods he got would I know the kind of goods he got. The price of goods I think he is mistaken in price of the article that he got. If he is correct in his statement you owe him 50 cts." All four of these illustrations are from the Patrick Papers.

¹² Such notes as that of W. A. Stickney to J. C. Brown, June 1, 1893 (in Brown Papers), indicate a sense of grades of merchandise: "Please send me a barrel of flour (family)." On July 16, 1892, the same customer asked for "40 to 60 pounds of sugar (family use)." Invoices carried several grades of flour. Sometimes there were as many as six grades, arranged in the order of their respective qualities. See J. C. Brown, *Invoice Book*, 1894, *passim*.

¹³ The higher rate applied especially to goods in the drug, notion, and general supply lines. The lower rate sometimes applied to the prices charged for staples. A good case is to be found in the prices charged by B. F. Avery and Sons of Louisville. They allowed a two per cent discount for settlement within ten to ninety days, and a reduction of 35

an interest charge of 8 to 15 per cent which possibly boosted the final purchase price of an item from 25 to 75 per cent. It seems to have been a universal practice to set a rate of interest and to reckon the amount due on a yearly basis. This system has been described many times heretofore, but no mention has been made of the random interest charges of two to five dollars on ten to twenty-five dollar accounts. These charges are important because the average account was small, and any irregularity of interest rates caused a marked price increase for the goods.

Accounts were closed generally during the months of October, November, and December, and the new books opened in January, February, and March. Accounts were listed just as the purchases were made. At the end of the year the debit entries were added together and an interest charge entered against the total account. The average rate was ten per cent, but a mere statement of the interest rate is only a part of the usury picture. It does not take into consideration either the time element involved or the ultimate interest rate which the customer was forced to pay. Where distribution of lien allowances was so apportioned that one of the heaviest months was at crop gathering time, or when crop prospects were good and the merchant extended the amount of credit which a customer was allowed for the year, returns from interest charges moved upward at a phenomenal pace.¹⁴ In this way

per cent of the gross bill, giving the merchant a 37 per cent margin over what they stated to be a reasonable retail price. The merchant, however, was free to establish his own retail price. For a specific example of this trade practice, see J. C. Brown, *Invoice Book*, 1894, p. 151. Meat, lard, sugar, and meal yielded a profit of 25 to 40 per cent. The price summary quoted here is the result of checking invoice books against personal accounts in journals and ledgers for the J. C. Brown house, Henderson Brothers, Ike Jones, T. G. Patrick and Company, Calvin Brice and Company, Reed Brothers, and J. C. and R. E. Williams. It is not always possible, however, to arrive at an absolutely true picture of prices because of the failure to record grades with the itemized entries. Likewise, it is not always possible to know whether an entry for flour is for a barrel or a half-barrel. On top of this confusion, wholesale houses met their competition by giving "free goods" orders, and these added to merchants' profits. Characteristic of this practice is an invoice entry from the Blackwell's Durham Tobacco Company, in which the F. R. Frankenstein Company of Natchez was given ten 25-pound boxes of soap with an order for the same amount of tobacco. F. R. Frankenstein Company, *Invoice Book*, 1897, p. 274 (*Archives of Louisiana State University*).

¹⁴ A casual examination of any furnishing merchant's account books will reveal this fact. Few subjects caused so much discussion in the press. Editorial comments are to be

heavy purchases of goods often came near the date of settlement, with the consequence that costs were much higher.

There was an additional interest factor which seldom shows up in store records. When a landlord "stood for" accounts, he often kept either a duplicate record or carried his tenants' charges in his own personal account, and instead of being allowed to settle at the store, the tenant was required to pay the landlord. The tenant was charged both the storekeeper's mark-up and interest costs, and he paid interest to the landlord for taking the risk by "standing for" the account. Occasionally the landlord increased his annual income by purchasing staple goods in bulk lots at cheaper prices and selling them at mark-up profit for himself.¹⁵

found in the Elberton (Ga.) *New South*, January 3, September 12, 1883; the Hamilton (Ga.) *Visitor*, July 11, 1873; the Columbiana (Ala.) *Shelby Guide*, June 4, 11, 1872; and the Greensboro (Ga.) *Herald*, August 10, 1882. Among the reports put out by the state departments of agriculture and labor, the most comprehensive investigation of credit and general economic conditions is the one by W. N. Jones, *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the State of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1887). For an excellent practical picture of the lien system at work, see the T. G. Patrick Journals, 1878-1915. A great deal of the money paid out by farmers for picking cotton was supplied by merchants. If crops were good there was a liberalizing of allowances on liens. Characteristic of this sort of credit extension is the following note from Mark H. White to J. C. and R. E. Williams, Eagleville, Tennessee, August 9, 1891 (Williams Papers, Williams Store, Eagleville): "Gents, Bob Phillips the bearer of this wishes to get some goods of you. He has a good crop here & if he does not pay for them in the Fall I will. He wants about \$10 or 1500 [fifteen] dollars worth. By letting him have them you will oblige your friend &c." Another note indicating the increased trading activity is that from J. J. Bledsoe, "1/2 Chance," Alabama, to J. C. Brown, September 15, 1897 (J. C. Brown Papers), in which he said: "I send 2 bales of cotton will try & send you 2 more by first week in October. Please send me 1 barrel good flour, 1 can Am. sardines, 1 sack coarse salt if you have not the other will do, 1 box soda crackers. 1 can lard good 1 case 1 oz snuff. I will settle the above bill in a few days."

¹⁵ It was a common practice for landlords to do this. Frequently when a farmer ordered goods for a tenant he asked that they be charged to his account. An excellent example of this practice on an extensive scale is the record of General John Bratton's transactions, contained in the T. G. Patrick Journal, 1878-1900. Another is the private farm account of D. C. Bennett, Louisville, Mississippi, 1898-1918. The following note from Norfleet Harris to J. C. Brown (undated), reveals this kind of landlord-tenant relationship: "The bearer Stonewall Scott is a workman my place— he wants spokes and rims for four wheels. I will see it paid in the fall if you are willing to sell them that way. So if he gets them send me a bill of same & I will charge up to him & you can charge to me." (J. C. Brown Papers). In fact, hundreds of order notes which went to merchants amplify this statement.

Other types of interest charges were also collected, as is illustrated by the following note from Ben Calvin to T. G. Patrick in Fairfield County, South Carolina. "Mr. t. g. patrige," he wrote, "Please sin me is meny seads is you Can and will retoin them Back out off the first Coton Seads and will pay you the third on a Bushill." In an endorsement the merchant instructed a clerk to "let him have them."¹⁶

Most of the above facts can be determined with some degree of clarity. Interest charges were entered in the books at the time of settlement. Likewise, mark-up prices were often recorded in code on invoices at the time goods were placed on the shelves. But it is extremely difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the complete picture of store transactions, because of oral agreements and settlements which were made and accepted. A case in point is that of a customer who on the verge of bankruptcy secured a full cash settlement of his account at only a fractional part of the total; the merchant reasoning that it was better to get as much as possible in advance than nothing after the proceedings had been completed. Yet, in the books, the account was either balanced or marked off completely.¹⁷ Oral transactions confuse the whole picture of the trade of the furnishing merchant. Many of them made arrangements and allowances orally, and seldom was a record made of them. The furnishing trade was always a highly personalized matter.

The credit system in the South was largely a product of the sore lack of adequate transportation facilities. Perhaps the central theme of all comment on certain of the South's failures was that of diversification of field crops. When Henry W. Grady wrote his eloquent editorials on the southern ills, he appreciated the significance of the failure of the southern farmers to broaden their base of production. Many of Grady's articles, however, have the tone of the promoter who is critical of the South's economic system, but not too much so to attract outside capital.

¹⁶ In Patrick Papers.

¹⁷ Every set of books kept by general merchandising stores contain realistic pictures of the mortgage and lien system at work. See, specifically, the Mortgage Books, J. C. Brown Store, Faunsdale, Alabama, and the William Henderson Ledgers, Miller's Ferry, Alabama. The Ike Jones Ledgers, Black Hawk, Mississippi, show the course of unsettled accounts.

In his article "Cotton and Its Kingdom," published in *Harper's Magazine* in 1881, Grady reiterated his charge of the neglect on the part of the southern farmer to raise his food. He failed, however, to offer a satisfactory solution of the farmer's predicament by suggesting an alternative cash crop which would improve conditions in the entire region. In fact, it was customary for all earlier critics of the cotton system to choose the less difficult mode of attack by describing the unsatisfactory furnishing and credit system. They were able to search out the weak spots and to portray them with a vividness that chilled their readers. So clear and realistic did they make their descriptions that they overlooked almost entirely such important contributory factors as possible cash markets for other farm products, an intelligent discussion of the margin of cash necessary for successful southern farming, non-competitive sectional potentialities of southern agriculture other than cotton growing, and, finally, the question of adequate railroad facilities as a necessary adjunct to farming.¹⁸

Literally hundreds of editorials and special feature accounts of poor roads found their way into newspapers. Practically every southern farmer living as much as five miles from a town faced the problem of poor roads every time he hitched his mules to a wagon. State laws were cluttered with ineffective legislation relating to roads, and county officials strove with some degree of continuity, if indifferently, to build local highways. Yet in nearly all the condemnation of the one-crop system of agriculture and miry roads there is an absence of any practical sense of appreciation of the importance of improved and diversified market conditions. The critics themselves failed to understand the necessity for markets for new southern products. It was here that their crusading for reform hit a major snag, and failure to solve this made

¹⁸ Henry W. Grady, "Cotton and Its Kingdom," in *Harper's Magazine* (New York, 1850-), LXIII (1881), 719-34; Otken, *Ills of the South*, 54-96; Hammond, *Cotton Industry*, 166-226; Henry W. Grady, *The New South* (New York, 1890), 188-91, 208-30. See, also, an article by Grady, entitled "A Georgia Farmer," in Greensboro (Ga.) *Herald*, August 10, 1882. Other newspaper comments on this subject are also significant. Accounts of the South's purchase of staples are in Huntsville (Ala.) *Advocate*, August 30, 1882, and Columbiana (Ala.) *Shelby Guide*, February 29, June 11, 1872. A colorful allegory of a cropping mortgage appeared in the Elberton (Ga.) *Gazette*, April 4, 1880.

their pleas historically true, but impossible of realization. What was true of highways was likewise true of railroads and their connections with market centers, and railway freight rates on farm products were so high that often they erased any margin of profit farmers could rightfully expect.¹⁹

Had transportation and market conditions been different it seems safe to assume, in the light of the facts of business operations and possibilities, that merchants would have welcomed an opportunity to broaden their income basis for their trading areas. There can be little doubt that the fluctuations of cotton production and prices held the same eventual fate for the merchant as for the farmer. Credit was restricted or expanded in many cases on the basis of whether weather, general crop, and market conditions were good.²⁰

Frequent notes found their way to merchants in late summer asking for permission to extend accounts. Dependence upon cotton alone, however, was dangerous for the merchant. At the last moment the cotton market was subject to serious and unexpected fluctuations, and cotton was a highly competitive crop because several sections of the South glutted the market and forced prices down at selling time. But with all of its disadvantages cotton had some marked advantages over other farm products. Where roads were universally poor and methods of hauling were still primitive cotton could be transported with relatively small loss to either producer or merchant. The problem of maintaining storage warehouses was simple, because the major problem was that of keeping the cotton dry and fires away. There was an es-

¹⁹ Perhaps the most outstanding failure in the New South's history has been the failure to comprehend fully the importance of new products from old resources, and the possibility of new crops. The story of the slow realization that cottonseed alone had a good market value is significant. Likewise, the recent date for placing peanuts, citrus fruits, and southern vegetables on the market documents this conservatism.

²⁰ J. M. Gayden to T. G. Patrick, August 16, 1886 (Patrick Papers): "Let Frank have the amt. of \$1100 [eleven dollars] in cash & trade and chd to me with the per cent on ca. [*sic*] I will make plenty of cot to pay you all I owe you & think I will clear rite sharp besize. my crop is a great deal better than last year & have no rent to pay & oblige." The full story of crop loans can be read in the merchants' journals and ledgers. Goods were supplied or withheld on the basis of crop prospects, and this fact is reflected in the personal accounts.

established market with a long tradition behind it, and it was fairly easy to secure adequate outside capital to finance the trade.²¹

More perishable farm products would not have stood the abuse of being hauled over southern dirt roads or transported on southern streams in ill-equipped boats. Corn lacked much of being a satisfactory product for shipping any considerable distance except under the most favorable circumstances. Many other farm products were as bulky as corn, and were subject to ruinous damage in the average rural or small town warehouse. These are some of the main reasons why both southern farmers and merchants clung steadfastly to a traditional cash crop instead of pioneering in wider fields offered by diversification. It was here that the critics often failed to do more than convince most of their readers of the farmers' impracticability. This traditionalism plus a lack of imagination on the part of critics and planners of the agricultural South were as much to blame for the region's one crop system of agriculture as were the sins of the furnishing merchants.

An examination of the contemporary writings on the supply system to southern farmers after 1865 reveals many weaknesses. Henry W. Grady's statement in the *New York Ledger* in 1889, that merchants sought a bacon and corn trade for profit and that production of these commodities at home threatened loss of credit, is of doubtful value. This idea was enlarged upon by other contemporary observers,²² but it is not as logical as they seemed to think. They believed that cotton was the most ready means for securing cash, and perhaps they subscribed to the notion that because it was inedible the merchant was sure that it would find its way to market. At the same time, however, they might have been expected to see that once the normal demand for

²¹ Somers, *The Southern States since the War*, 79; Andrews, *The South since the War*, 324-56; Latham, Alexander and Company, *Cotton Movement and Fluctuations*. The last is an excellent summary of cotton reports, productions, and sales. Prices listed in this series of cotton statistics are based upon New York middling for the most part.

²² In addition to Otken, *Ills of the South*, and Hammond, *Cotton Industry*, cited above, see George K. Holmes, "The Peons of the South," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Philadelphia, 1890-), IV (1894), 265-74, and "A Decade of Mortgages," *ibid.*, IV, 904-18.

food was met then other commodities could be carried to market with as much surety of arrival as cotton.

The argument, which has been advanced on numerous occasions, that one main reason for cotton's becoming a staple crop in the post-war South was its inedibility, would seem to be wholly fallacious. Certainly no merchant ever hinted at such a thing in an interview with the author, and no such implication appears in the mercantile records examined. Instead, many merchants have been known to advise customers to plant more food and feed crops in order to leave more of their cotton money clear. Such a sentiment appears in notes in which both landlords and merchants "shut off" supplies to their tenants and customers in late summer. The post-war merchant looked upon cotton as a ready-cash crop, the culture of which was well understood, and for which there was already a partial legal structure to protect its production and sale. To argue that the inedibility of cotton was an important factor in production is ridiculous in the light of the fact that clothing was practically as much a matter of primary concern as food. In most communities of the post-war South spinning wheels and looms were not wholly unknown, and it was just as possible to lose money on cotton used for home consumption in the manufacture of clothing as it was on edible products. The whole point in the furnishing trade was profit, and an intensive examination of invoice and account books indicates that perhaps a greater profit was to be made in the sale of clothing and notions than in provisions.

On the other hand, to deny the ready-cash angle of the cotton trade would be equally ridiculous. Cotton brought fairly sure money if market conditions were favorable, and its sale could be carried on with some degree of safety to the merchant even under the most haphazard conditions. State laws protected the sale of the staple, and the use of serial numbers and initials branded on bales made crops traceable all the way from the spinner back to the producer. Where growers were guilty of "plating," or placing bales over boiling cauldrons of water to absorb additional weight, or of placing rocks and scrap iron in bales, both the

losses and the fines could be passed back to the planter.²³ Likewise, the farmer was practically forced by a general understanding among the merchants to sell his cotton where he bought his supplies and fertilizer, in order to guarantee the creditor an opportunity to collect his bills. Persons having remnants of bales found it difficult under state laws and general market conditions to sell them, except to merchants who had control of supplies.

There is more to the story of the place of cotton in the general southern furnishing trade than the contemporary writers indicated. Few, if any, merchants ever would admit that they made a profit out of buying cotton.²⁴ As a matter of fact they claimed that they stood a reasonable chance of losing. They bought cotton as representatives of the cotton brokers, and to cover their accounts. This much of the control story is true, but the logic of claiming that credit was reduced because customers reduced their cotton acreage is of doubtful foundation. The fallacy here is the fact that literally thousands of bare subsistence accounts were so limited in their purchases that if the customer had twice the money to spend he would in no way have been extrava-

²³ For the legal protection of cotton sales and the practice of the trade, see charges made against Matt Brown, January 25, 1892, in Ike Jones Ledger (Black Hawk, Mississippi), 1891-1894, p. 145. For characteristic local statutory regulations of the cotton trade, see *Code of Alabama*, 1907, Vol. I, *Criminal*, chap. 196, secs. 6671-6690, pp. 456-60, and chap. 215, sec. 6878, pp. 535-36; *ibid.*, Vol. II, *Civil*, chap. 71, secs. 3730-3734, pp. 514-15; *Code of Laws of South Carolina*, 1902, chap. XXXIV, art. II, secs. 1543-1556, pp. 600-609. The following letter from T. G. Patrick and Company, Whiteoak, South Carolina, to G. L. Kennedy, Blackstock, South Carolina, September 16, 1910, is indicative of this: "In case any of our tenants (those living on lands of T. G. & R. A. Patrick) sell you cotton please make check payable to us. We hold claims on them for rent and supplies and we do not wish for them to get any money out of cotton until our claims are satisfied" (Patrick Papers). The laws of the states regulated the lien system. See, for example, *Code of Alabama*, 1907, Vol. I, *Criminal*, chap. 246, secs. 7342-7343, pp. 758-59.

²⁴ A careful search into cotton as a factor in the furnishing trade seems to reveal the fact that merchants bought cotton with money supplied them by brokers. They unanimously deny that they ever made money on buying cotton *per se*. Fertilizer companies allowed their dealers handsome profits, and they relied upon the storekeepers as representatives to sell their goods. In order to collect debts owed to them it was necessary that merchants buy cotton even at a small loss. It would be practically impossible to tell whether a merchant did or did not make money buying cotton. Even with numerous cotton sales books available, there are too many technical factors involved to reach any absolute conclusion.

gant. Any merchant who had common sense enough to make entries in his account book was able to read the story year after year written in the accounts which were stabilized at the barest possible minimum. Credit columns in ledgers revealed that in many cases there was insufficient cotton to settle the year's bill, and it was necessary either to involve the land in debt or to perform labor and drayage services for the merchant in order to establish a balance. The margin of profit actually would have been greater for the merchant if a majority of his customers had been able to grow adequate foodstuff, and to clear a modest cotton crop with which to purchase a larger assortment of higher quality merchandise. A clear-cut case of this is to be found in the accounts of J. C. Williams, a Tennessee merchant located in an area where a fairly adequate balance in agriculture was maintained. The storekeeper did a yearly business from 1905 to 1909, of about \$19,000, of which \$5,000 was credit and the remainder cash or barter. Annually this store made a profit of more than \$5,000, and the "mark-off" of accounts was remarkably light. In comparison, the J. C. Brown store in Faunsdale, Alabama, did a three-year business covering the years 1897, 1898, and 1899, of \$54,167.05. Expenditures were \$31,111.09, leaving the storekeeper a book profit of \$23,055.96.²⁵

Farmers who depended upon cotton alone often found themselves in an impossible credit situation. Characteristic of this was the *impasse* which occurred between Georgia farmers and merchants in 1881 and 1882.²⁶ The impatient editor of the Greensboro *Herald* said: "Oh, yes, farmers cotton is king! A merchant in this city sold some cotton in Savannah last week at 41¼ that he bought last September, and he lost \$20 a bag on it. But still cotton is king. Meat at ten cents cash, corn

²⁵ J. C. Williams Ledger (Eagleville, Tennessee), 1905-1909, "Business Summary." J. C. Brown Ledger (Faunsdale, Alabama), 1897-1899, pp. 1-12. Additional summaries give some indication of the volume of business carried on in a general furnishing store. J. T. Christian Cashbook (Northport, Alabama), 1884-1915 (in possession of Christian Store). The Christian business grew from \$16,719.97 to \$293,973.69. The Drane and Dupre store began operation in January, 1870, at Raymond, Mississippi, and during the years 1870-1874 it averaged approximately \$15,000 a year. Drane and Dupre Journal, 1871-1875 (Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson).

²⁶ Greensboro (Ga.) *Herald*, September 15, October 20, November 3, 20, 1881; February 2, 9, 23, March 23, April 13, 1882.

going up gradually, cotton down; but the farmers don't need such trifles: cotton is just the thing of course: men, women and children and horses and mules can eat cotton and grow fat on it. Put in more cotton farmers. Four or five cents a pound now, who knows but what it will open next fall at three cents! Plant more cotton—plant all cotton and get rich!”²⁷

This torrid outburst prefaced what was called locally a period of “squally times.” Crops were short and farmers were without supplies. They had to eliminate petty luxuries and “learned to do on nothing.” Corn sold at \$1.05 cash or \$1.26½ on credit to the first of November in 20 bushel lots. By March, 1882, the editor of the *Herald* was doubtful that most people would be able to get through the year. “Meat,” he said, “was so empty sounding and meaningless an expression with many.” Merchants got all the farmers had made. The little farmers had “guanoed” themselves out of credit for something to eat, and the big ones only delayed eventual failure by hauling another year's supply to their farms to grow another diminishing crop of cotton. The year 1882 promised to be a poor one in the light of what had happened in the previous growing season, and merchants refused credit extensions. By February the editor of the *Herald* literally snarled in an editorial because of the stupidity of his neighbors. “Five lots of property sold, *fi fa* at half its real value.” Three months later when farmers were told they could have no more credit the editor taunted them with the doleful statement “no meal in the tub and meat in the smokehouse.”²⁸

This unhappy situation in 1881 and 1882 was not peculiar to the Georgia cotton belt alone. Elsewhere farmers were in the same plight. They were victims of a credit system which had been revived in 1865 from the ruins of ante-bellum agriculture. The year the Civil War ended, New York middling export cotton was selling on August 1 for 43.20, and it entered a generally descending price range until it reached the low level of ten cents, or almost half this amount to the grower. As the price sagged production rose from 2,269,316 bales to 6,949,756

²⁷ *Ibid.*, May 5, 1881.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, February 2, 9, 1882.

in the growing season of 1882. This rapid increase in the amount of cotton produced not only inflated the amount of cotton available, but it likewise set up a competitive condition among the farmers of the various cotton growing areas of the South.²⁹

Behind these inanimate statistics of prices and production is the intensely human story of the little producer who was without resources except for his ability to labor with his own hands. Analyses of the account of two representative customers of furnishing merchants tell an eloquent story. Matt Brown, a Mississippi Negro, purchased goods from the Jones store at Black Hawk, Mississippi, for the period 1884-1901. During this time he closed his account each year with an accumulated indebtedness of approximately \$450. At the same time credit listed on his account ranged from as low as \$43.01 in 1889 to as high as \$416.78 in 1896; the latter figure being produced by an artificial credit entry being made by the execution of either a personal note or chattel mortgage.³⁰ The distribution of Matt Brown's account for two representative years presents a fascinating picture of the whole business of furnishing goods to the small operator who more often than not failed to produce enough crops each year to meet his obligations of accumulated debts and current expenditures. He began the year 1892 with a transferred indebtedness from former years of \$226.84, and by the date of a final settlement on January 3, 1893, he had increased this obligation to \$452.41.³¹ His credits, coming from the sale of cotton, cutting wood, clearing land, and hauling for the store, amounted to \$171.12, or \$54.45 less than he spent. During the year he spent \$35.15 for food, \$29.45 for clothing, \$173.64 for household and farm supplies, such as bagging and ties, mule and land rent, ginning, plow tools, and seeds, 55 cents for drugs, \$4.00 in cash loans,

²⁹ For what is apparently a complete picture of the expansion in cotton statistics, 1853-1908, see Latham, Alexander and Company, *Cotton Movement and Fluctuations, 1898-1903*, 106-108, and *ibid.*, 1903-1908 (New York, 1908), 169-84. Doubtless these commercial statistics of the production and prices of cotton give a much more intimate and accurate conception of the detail of cotton trade than do reports of the Bureau of the Census and generalized editorials and articles on the trade.

³⁰ Ike Jones Ledger, 1884-1901, continuous personal account of Matt Brown.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 1892, 1896.

and \$112.81 for miscellaneous supplies. Of this last expenditure, \$9.75 was for chewing tobacco and snuff.

Four years later Matt Brown brought forward from date of settlement in 1895 an indebtedness of \$387.16 or an accretion of \$160.32 over a period of three years. His food bill this year was \$8.42, clothing, \$27.25, farm and household supplies, \$38.30, drugs, 95 cents, cash loan, \$2.35, and miscellaneous, \$12.08. He finished the year with an indebtedness of \$476.69, and he produced enough cotton to yield a credit of only \$58.76. Although the record is not entirely clear, it appears that this account was finally settled by a mortgage, and in 1905 an entry appears for a coffin and burial supplies, and the record is closed permanently with the deficit being wiped out by the simple act of "marking it off."³²

Matt Brown's account, except for expenditure for food, followed the orthodox pattern of southern marginal farm family buying. In South Carolina, S. R. Simonton opened an account with T. G. Patrick, and characteristic of the middle-class white farmer he ran up a rather large account the first year. His expenditures amounted to \$918.63 while his credits were only \$307.31, leaving an unpaid balance of \$611.32 which he settled by note. For the seven years from 1878 to 1885, he spent \$2,681.02 and produced credit enough to pay \$687.31. Internal evidence in this account seems to indicate that the deficit was finally paid by a transfer of land. At least charges were entered for registered letters containing deeds.

A brief summary of the Simonton account shows that for the year 1879 he spent \$52.45 for foodstuff, \$7.75 for clothing, \$63.85 for household supplies, \$117.45 for cash loans, and \$9.55 for miscellaneous supplies. He spent \$251.05, as compared with \$918.63 the year before. His crop was so poor that he was able to pay only \$3.30, and he had to pay \$247.95 by note.³³

These analyses are of accounts which were selected after a considerable amount of examination of general store records to indicate the

³² *Ibid.*, 1905, p. 188.

³³ T. G. Patrick and Company Journals, 1879, 1883-1884.

common characteristics of the lien and furnishing businesses. Both of these seem to involve land in their final settlement and for most merchants, land, valued at low prices, was often the only safe security available. There was involved in land dealing, however, the exceedingly delicate question of foreclosure, and not even the hardest hearted furnishing merchant relished the opprobrium which was likely to result from the public sale of chattel goods and land for debt.³⁴ It was much simpler to secure a transfer of ownership of chattels and deeds to land than to foreclose by forced sale. It was in this way that furnishing merchants accumulated large tracts of land, and sometimes men who started out as merchants became larger farmers who gradually came to run their stores as adjuncts to their farming operations. Doubtless many merchants insured the future success of their stores by building up a controlled trade upon their own private domains. So prevalent did the custom of giving land as security become that it was common practice in much of the South to speculate on the amount of mortgage every man had on his farm and as to the probable date on which he would have either to secure an abundance of providential assistance or be foreclosed.

Some merchants made money from their stores. Some of them were able to accumulate a considerable amount of cash savings. Others accumulated little money, but came to own large holdings of land. Most of them were able to build comparatively good homes, but it is doubtful that many of them ever grew rich in the business. When the boll weevil reduced the cotton crop, and when competition of cash stores developed with an expansion of industry, the old line furnishing merchant went into eclipse in the South. His end came only after he had committed countless sins against real southern agricultural progress, and had been properly criticized for it in the newspaper and peri-

³⁴ Liens and mortgages in final legal execution were settled by public sales, but perhaps a majority of the final acts of settlement were by private transfer of crops and property. Account books carry frequent notations, "settled by note." When a debtor was unable to carry his note longer on a satisfactory basis he quietly transferred his property to his creditor to avoid unfortunate publicity. In interviews on this point with scores of merchants whose business history goes well back into the nineteenth century, there was almost a unanimous assertion that throughout their experience in business they had never publicly foreclosed a customer.

odical press, and even in books. But the question remains, what part did the furnishing merchant play? Actually he was never an originator of anything. He was the most direct means by which the lien laws were made to work as a source of credit and banking for his community. His safe bulged with thousands of liens and mortgages. His store was both a source of supply and a market facility. He facilitated the one crop system of agriculture, and as a special agent for the fertilizer companies he sold guano in April to be paid for at high November prices plus an exorbitant profit and interest charge. Also, he helped to channelize enormous amounts of extra-regional capital into the South.

On the credit side of the ledger he was to all outward appearances a stable citizen, often a school trustee, local bank president, postmaster, sometimes a railway agent, a source of character reference, official community "obliger," and a decisive voice in all other community affairs. His ledger books carried church and lodge accounts, and lists of subscriptions to build and support churches. He served on the board of stewards or deacons, and was often the member of the school board who was entrusted with the responsibility of selecting teachers and textbooks. But most important of all, he was only a cog in an economic machine which for the South was much larger than the individual influence of merely a simple form of mercantile business.

Efforts at Crop Control in Seventeenth Century America

BY THEODORE SALOUTOS

Our contemporary crop control problems are deeply rooted in the Anglo-American tradition, efforts to regulate or restrict production having been made in connection with the growing of tobacco in Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina as early as the first half of the seventeenth century.¹ In place of terms like "crop controls," "curtailment," and "production controls," there was used such phraseology as "cessation," "restraining acts," "suspension," "the stint," "lessening the planting," "restraint for planting tobacco," and "Restriccions and Prohibicions of planting, setting, sowing, or any waies tending any Tobacco."² Adopted simultaneously in the colonies and the British Isles, these controls had as their chief objectives the raising of tobacco prices and the establishing of a more balanced economy; and to a lesser degree they were expected to alleviate money shortages, stabilize the currency, improve the quality of the crop, and check the use of "the weed."³ It is significant

¹ Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Torchbearer of the Revolution* (Princeton, 1940), 20, refers to "a seventeenth century Agricultural Adjustment Act." See also, Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, 4 vols. (New Haven, 1934-1938), I, xiii. If, as Andrews wrote, the colonies of seventeenth century America represented "an English world . . . with but little in it that can strictly be called American," a reasonable assumption would be that crop controls were an outgrowth of English mercantilism.

² William H. Browne (ed.), *Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1636-1667*, in *Archives of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1883-), III (1885), 479, 504, 505, 507, 551. Cited hereinafter as *Archives of Maryland*, III.

³ Charles M. MacInnes, *The Early English Tobacco Trade* (London, 1926), 105-29, presents a convenient summary of tobacco suppression in England. George L. Beer, *The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660* (New York, 1908), 117-75, describes "The Stuart Regulation of the Tobacco Industry." See also, Curtis P. Nettels, *The Money Supply of the Colonies before 1720* (Madison, 1934), 218; Leo F. Stock (ed.), *Proceed-*

that the controls, which were allied also to colonial food shortages and imperial defense problems, were applied to a "luxury crop" and not to foodstuffs.⁴ Government aid was sought and even force was employed.⁵ Briefly, government-sponsored crop control programs were among the first to be advanced for solving the already emerging American farm problem.

Tobacco happened to be the first crop for which controls were seriously considered, simply because it was the first to attain commercial importance with its resulting overproduction.⁶ Climatic and geographic conditions, cheap lands and rich alluvial soils, convenient transportation facilities and imperial policies, the labor system, remunerative prices in the beginning, and growing market demands facilitated its being raised in quantities sufficient to depress prices.⁷ Influential planters, merchants, and shippers who found tobacco raising profitable helped to break down moral opposition to its production, as did the Crown when it discovered in it the means by which to raise additional revenues and thus aid in freeing itself from financial dependence on Parliament.⁸

Tobacco was raised in Virginia as early as 1612 and became available for export shortly thereafter.⁹ It became the chief staple as well as

ings and Debates of the British Parliament Respecting North America, 5 vols. (Washington, 1924-1941), I, 283, 285, 370-71; Lewis C. Gray, "The Market Surplus Problems of Colonial Tobacco," in *Agricultural History* (Chicago-Baltimore, 1927-), II (1928), 28-29; Philip A. Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1895), I, 254; Frederick W. Fairholt, *Tobacco; Its History and Associations* (London, 1889), 80-83; Alexander Young, *Chronicles of the First Planters of Massachusetts Bay from 1623 to 1636* (Boston, 1846), 146-47, 182-83.

⁴ John A. Doyle, *The English Colonies in America*, 5 vols. (New York, 1882-1907), I, 154.

⁵ The demand for government assistance was always present. See, for example, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, 40 vols. (London, 1860-1939), Vol. XI, *America and the West Indies*, 1681-1685, 226-27, 237-38; Edward D. Neill, *Virginia Carolorum* (Albany, 1886), 395; "Culpeper's Report on Virginia in 1683," in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (Richmond, 1893-), III (1896), 225.

⁶ For the early history of tobacco, see Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 78-100, and MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 27-104.

⁷ Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 192-93.

⁸ For a contrast in profits between tobacco raising and other crops, see Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, I, 235-36, 252, 254, 260. For the importance of tobacco in producing revenue, see *Archives of Maryland*, III, 510-12.

⁹ Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, I, 211-12.

a medium of exchange.¹⁰ Cheap, fertile lands to be had on easy terms induced many planters to "rack" out their grounds with tobacco and then "to proceed to virgin soil," leaving the exhausted soil "to recover for itself." The granting by the Crown to the planters of a monopoly of the English market in exchange for the right to tax the imported tobacco stimulated its production, as did the early rewards which tobacco raising held out to the planters. With high prices bearing little relation to the moderate production costs and the minimum capital, labor, and skill requirements, the raising of tobacco also became popular among the small producers who might otherwise have raised wheat or turned to some industry.¹¹ "Practically anybody could raise tobacco, but not anybody could make glass, iron, potash, and naval stores," while slave labor was "far better fitted for the monotonous task of producing a single crop than for a varied husbandry, which . . . requires some skill and versatility."¹² English shippers found tobacco handling profitable, because tobacco, being light and not bulky, could stand the heavy freight charges to the distant market; and the tobacco trade did more to encourage shipping than did "all the others put together."¹³ Equitable and favorable transportation facilities, which placed competing tobacco districts at almost identical competitive levels, also stimulated production.

Demands for crop controls grew as tobacco prices dropped. The precise origins of such controls are not clear, but it is not surprising that demands for government controls persisted in an era which had feared that "unrestrained competition" would bring "chaos and an-

¹⁰ Nettels, *Money Supply of the Colonies*, 213-214; Margaret S. Morriss, *Colonial Trade of Maryland, 1689-1715* (Baltimore, 1914), 21-57; Leonidas Dodson, *Alexander Spotswood, Colonial Governor of Virginia, 1710-1722* (Philadelphia, 1932), 50; Meyer Jacobstein, *The Tobacco Industry in the United States* (New York, 1907), 25; Susan M. Kingsbury (ed.), *The Records of the Virginia Company of London*, 4 vols. (Washington, 1906-1935), IV, 22, 47, 65, 95-96, 104, 269, 286-88, 456, 457, 458, 473.

¹¹ Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 192-93; Avery O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860* (Urbana, 1926), 42-43; Jacobstein, *Tobacco Industry in the United States*, 16-17; Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 86-87, 91-92.

¹² Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History*, I, 126.

¹³ MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 3-4. See also, Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 91, and Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 192-93.

archy."¹⁴ Under mercantilism, "the State determines the nature of the economic activities . . . encouraging certain forms . . . and discouraging others." Production controls, however, seem originally to have been confined almost entirely to urban pursuits, the "stint" being employed chiefly by the merchant and craft guilds. There appear no evidences of such controls among agricultural producers for price raising purposes; and if the times tolerated such practices, there were few, if any, evidences of them among the producers of foodstuffs prior to the seventeenth century.¹⁵ The fact that the earlier farming was chiefly of a subsistence variety is good evidence that production controls were relatively unknown.¹⁶

Controls, when they came, were of two types—direct and indirect. The indirect controls included such practices as promoting the raising of corn, rapeseed, potatoes, flax, silk, and hemp, and establishing industries. Direct controls specified the amount of tobacco to be raised, limited the number of leaves to be tended and picked per person, and restricted the planting dates.¹⁷ Intercolonial as well as intracolonyal programs were sponsored.¹⁸

¹⁴ Jacobstein, *Tobacco Industry in the United States*, 23. See also, MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 35; Ephraim Lipson, *The Economic History of England*, 3 vols. (London, 1915-1931), II, 454; Marcus W. Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes in Colonial America, 1607-1783* (Chicago, 1931), 5.

¹⁵ The leading authorities on sixteenth century economy in England have unearthed no evidence of production control practices among the agricultural producers of that century. See especially, Lipson, *Economic History of England*; Richard H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (New York, 1912); Norman S. B. Gras, *The Evolution of the English Corn Market from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1915); James E. Thorold Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1866-1902). Tawney refers to the use of the stint "where there was not sufficient grazing land to allow of each tenant pasturing as many beasts as he pleased." *Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, 160.

¹⁶ Especially noteworthy is Lipson's statement that English farmers "raised corn in excess of their personal needs, so that they carried on agriculture with a view to profit as well as to satisfy the requirements of their household." *Economic History of England*, II, 419. Such "excess corn," most likely, was raised for sale in the local market. See Tawney, *Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, 111-12.

¹⁷ Neill, *Virginia Carolorum*, 291; "Virginia in 1662-1665," in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, XVIII (1910), 423.

¹⁸ William H. Browne (ed.), *Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1667-1675*, in *Archives of Maryland*, V (1887), 15-16 (Cited hereinafter as *Archives of Maryland*, V); *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies, 1574-1660*, 292.

There were at least three concerted moves for crop controls during the seventeenth century. The first of these fell within the period from 1619-1620 to 1639-1640; the second during the 1660's; and the third during the first half of the 1680's. During the period from 1619-1620 to 1639-1640, the movement assumed several forms: first, that of bettering the quality of the crop; second, of seeking a general over-all reduction within the colony of Virginia, without guarantees of higher prices or benefit payments for the participating producers other than hopes for better prices; third, of having merchants contract for the purchase of the entire colonial crop, the Privy Council or royal agents assuming the right to restrict the amount to be raised; and fourth, of attempting to prohibit tobacco raising in England and Ireland for the sake of giving to colonial planters an exclusive monopoly of the British market.¹⁹

The second great wave, that of the 1660's, witnessed a concerted move for intercolonial co-operation, the pros and cons of controls being aired by representatives of Virginia and Maryland. Proposals for crop controls threatened to affect several interests, for by that time tobacco raising had become thoroughly enmeshed with the fiscal needs of the Crown, imperial defense, and shipping, and the problem of finding new occupations for those who derived their sole source of income from tobacco.²⁰

By the 1680's the issue of crop controls became involved with problems of representative institutions. The sudden proroguing, in 1682, of the Virginia Assembly which had met with high hopes of enacting "cessation" legislation brought on a brief wave of plant cutting and

¹⁹ Regarding controls for bettering the quality, see Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, I, 254. For other types of control, see *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies, 1574-1660*, 35, 160; Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 119-26, 165-68; MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 93-99; Stock (ed.), *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliament Respecting North America*, I, 91-92.

²⁰ *Archives of Maryland*, V, 5-9, 15-19. For illustrations of the attempts made to "inhibit" planting in England during the 1660's and 1670's, see Stock (ed.), *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliament Respecting North America*, I, 283, 285, 370-71, 381.

rioting similar to that visited upon the tobacco planters of Kentucky and Tennessee from 1906 to 1908.²¹

The earliest form of crop control on this side of the Atlantic called for the destruction of the poorer grades, a typical law being the one enacted by the Virginia Assembly in 1619 for the burning of inferior tobacco. In 1623, this law was amended to provide for the appointment of "sworn men in each settlement to condemn all bad tobacco."²² Crop control entered a new phase about 1622 when a group of "ancient planters," fearful that they would perish "unless protected," asked that "the king make tobacco his commodity and settle the price and quantity to be yearly taken from the Colony, so that they may in future plant some real commodity."²³ A "tobacco contract," rescinded in 1623, appears to have been concerned more with granting the exclusive right to import tobacco into England to a group of merchants than with restricting production as a means of raising prices for the producers.²⁴ Proposals were made for the purchase of Virginia tobacco in 1627, and again in 1632, when Governor John Harvey wrote to the Virginia commissioners suggesting that the English merchants contract for the entire crop for three or four years, the quantity to be grown to be restricted by the Privy Council. Again the attempt "bore no fruit." In 1634, a royal proclamation called for the appointment of commissioners "to contract for all colonial tobacco at reasonable rates."²⁵ Once more the contract scheme ended in failure; but in 1637 the burgesses accepted with reservations the "policy of limiting the size of tobacco crop."²⁶

In the meantime, Charles I had reiterated the need for determining the quantity of tobacco to be imported into England in the future and

²¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XI, *America and the West Indies*, 1681-1685, 226-27.

²² Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia*, I, 254.

²³ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies*, 1574-1660, 35; Kingsbury (ed.), *Records of the Virginia Company*, I, 58-81.

²⁴ Kingsbury (ed.), *Records of the Virginia Company*, IV, 2-3, 29-36, 53-57, 124, 163, 212, 488-89, 505, 519, 535-36, 548-51, 561-62. Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History*, I, 150-64, deals with the tobacco contract.

²⁵ Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 152-53.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 156.

the necessity for appointing agents for purchasing the crop at reasonable prices. His objectives seem to have been to increase the revenues of the Crown and to "divert the colonies from too great a reliance upon the tobacco crop"; but when Lord Goring, chief of the royal agents, offered "to purchase yearly 1,600,000 pounds of tobacco at six pence a pound in the colonies or at eight pence in England," the Virginia burgesses refused the contract, even though the terms were considered "very favorable" by some important Virginians.²⁷

Beginning in 1628, orders and statutory enactments came thick and fast in Virginia, and the means proposed to attain these ends tended to be more specific. In 1628 the governor proclaimed that the tobacco raised must "not interfere with the production of corn, that plants be set at least four and a half feet apart, and that not more than twelve leaves be gathered from a plant." In 1629 two legislative enactments provided that "newcomers . . . be restrained from planting tobacco the first year" and that tobacco planting was "to be limited to 3,000 per head, workers in the ground alone considered, 1,000 additional plants per poll being allowed for women and children." An enactment of 1629-1630 ordered that "No one is to plant or tend more than two thousand tobacco plants for each member of his family, including women and children," and that "bad tobacco used as legal tender" was to be burned "and the offender forbidden to plant any more until authorized . . . by the General Assembly."²⁸ When Governor John Harvey arrived in Virginia in 1630, he found "no other commodity but tobacco," and a "great want of corn." Tobacco was selling for less than one penny per pound, he reported, and he therefore began to encourage the planting of "rapeseed and potatoes" and ordered tobacco raising curtailed by one-third.²⁹

During 1631-1632 the restraining acts came even faster. One act

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 158-59.

²⁸ United States Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products by Government* (Agricultural Economics Bibliography, No. 23: Washington, 1927), 65.

²⁹ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies, 1574-1660*, 124, 160, 184.

specified that Frenchmen who had been sent to Virginia to plant vines should not be permitted to cultivate tobacco. Another provided that all producers of corn and tobacco had "to plant five vines per head before March 25 and twenty before the first day of March of the next year." Still another measure stipulated that no one was "to plant more than two thousand tobacco plants per member . . . subject to the penalty of having his whole crop cut down if he exceeded the stipulated amount," and the crop of each planter was "to be counted by a neighbor or 'some sufficient man.'" Another act specified that not more than fourteen leaves were to be tended per plant and that not more than nine of these were to be picked. The tending of seconds was prohibited. Additional legislation provided for the convening of the Virginia Assembly in the event that the earlier laws were found inadequate to regulate production. Acts passed in 1633 limited the number of tobacco plants to be raised to 1,500 per person and ordered "every planter to cultivate hemp and flax."⁸⁰

The results were disappointing. The colonists tried to get as much tobacco as possible from each plant; consequently, each plant had more poor quality leaves than the plants which had been cultivated prior to the legislation. In 1640 an act of the Assembly provided for the destruction of the "unmerchantable part as well as one-half of the good . . . so that the whole quantity produced might amount to one million five hundred thousand pounds."⁸¹ Governor Francis Wyatt wrote that "though the physic seems sharp yet I hope it will bring the body of the colony to a sounder condition of health than ever it enjoyed before." In the following year, Sir William Berkeley was given orders to regulate the "sale of wine and strong waters, impaling and fencing of orchards and stinting tobacco."⁸²

⁸⁰ Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products*, 66.

⁸¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies*, 1574-1660, 292; Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 95-100. In March, 1639, Henry Hawley, lieutenant general and governor of Barbados, was instructed "to go from plantation to plantation and inquire into the excessive quantities of tobacco grown, and treat with the several governors and the inhabitants necessary concerning the remedy of their inconvenience, and the price 'they will afford their tobacco,' with other business according to instructions."

⁸² *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies*, 1574-1660, 310, 321.

The colony of Maryland appears to have been several steps behind Virginia in the matter of control. Its first inspection law, passed in 1640, provided for the destruction of "bad tobacco, ground leaves, second crop leaves, etc."³³ One of the earliest attempts, if not the first, to regulate production in Maryland appeared in the instructions given the "sheriff of St. Maries to see that every hand planting tobacco shall plant and tend two acres of corn." It was not until 1657-1658, however, that new measures were adopted prohibiting the preparing of "any ground leaves or seconds upon any pretense whatsoever."³⁴

It became apparent as early as 1619 that neither co-operation within individual colonies nor intercolonial agreements would be adequate to insure the success of a crop control program, for colonial restrictions might easily have encouraged production in England and Ireland.³⁵ To prevent this, the Privy Council in 1619 inaugurated the policy of prohibiting tobacco planting "near London or Westminster." In 1621, all tobacco planted within that area was ordered sequestered; and in 1625 the prohibition was extended to all England. Two years later, the Privy Council authorized the "rotting-up" and destruction of "all English-grown tobacco in the Counties of Worcester, Gloucester, and Wilts . . . 17 places in Worcestershire, 40 in Gloucestershire, and Wotton Bassett in Wiltshire [were] named especially guilty." Later in the same year the prohibition against tobacco planting was extended to include "England, Ireland or any Island belonging thereto."³⁶

The Virginia Company was anxious to enforce restrictions, but difficulties were encountered in both England and Ireland. Government officials ordered to "displant" tobacco were given unceremonious receptions and found it difficult to prevent violators from gathering their

³³ Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products*, 54; Vertrees J. Wyckoff, *Tobacco Regulation in Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore, 1936), 51. A bill to restrict production was introduced in the Maryland Assembly in 1640, but it was defeated.

³⁴ Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products*, 55.

³⁵ Lipson, *Economic History of England*, III, 169-71; MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 79-80; Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 119, 126.

³⁶ Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products*, 44-45, gives a list of the acts of the Privy Council which sought to suppress tobacco raising in England from 1619 to 1639.

crops and taking them to London, where they were "sold as the colonial product." In 1627, Charles I had warned that continuous tobacco raising in England threatened the economic future of the colonies. Three years later the Virginia settlers complained that more tobacco was being raised in England than ever before, despite the parliamentary prohibitions. In 1631 and in 1634 Charles I repeated his warnings of 1627.

Briefly, it had become the practice of the government to continue issuing orders for prohibitions and for the English to continue to ignore the orders. Measures were adopted again in 1635, but in the following year the Privy Council found it necessary to order warrants issued "to the constables for the destruction of plants," particularly in Gloucestershire and Worcestershire. Special warrants were issued to officers to go through the various counties "with the object of destroying tobacco." Great quantities were reported destroyed as a result, but this did not diminish the amount raised, for in many places the planting continued. In 1639, the task of "destroying the plant was described as one of great difficulty and danger."⁸⁷

Tobacco planting had been "little known outside London and its suburbs" in 1619, but by the late 1630's "it had made its appearance in the counties of York, Lincoln, Nottingham, Worcester, Warwick, Monmouth, Gloucester, Wiltshire, in addition to Kent, Essex, Middlesex and Surrey." Since the Crown and Parliament were occupied with more pressing problems than suppressing recalcitrant tobacco producers, central controls broke down and the planters "cultivated their crops in comparative peace." Crop controls were "taken up again by the authorities" after the death of Charles I.⁸⁸

Virginia merchants revived their complaints against the English producers during the 1650's, after the relaxation of government decrees

⁸⁷ Beer, *Origins of British Colonial System*, 165-68.

⁸⁸ MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 93; Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History*, IV, 21. According to Andrews, "These commercial regulations . . . were not lost sight of during the disturbances and confusion of the period from 1640 to 1650. Whether the controlling power were king or parliament, executive or legislative, no material change was made in policy, either commercial or colonial."

applying to the colonies during the preceding decade had resulted in greatly increased tobacco supplies in both Maryland and Virginia. Once more they petitioned the English authorities for relief against the English planters. The imperial-minded government of Oliver Cromwell, cognizant of the importance of colonial prosperity to the imperial design and anxious to placate royalist elements in Virginia, pursued a policy of conciliation. Cromwell, likewise mindful of the fact that tobacco planting "had become widespread and lucrative" in many English counties during the Civil War, felt that a policy of moderation would prevent many planters from being driven "into the arms of the Royalists," who were prepared to make political capital out of any disaffection which might arise. A parliamentary act of 1652 voiced opposition to tobacco planting in England, but its spirit was circumvented in the numerous infractions which continued during the ensuing years.³⁹ "Throughout these years law had to play second fiddle to policy." Although Cromwell was anxious to promote colonial trade and protect merchant interests, he was not "prepared to . . . risk . . . alienating the support of a whole English countryside."⁴⁰

The second great movement for controls, coming during the 1660's, was accompanied by simultaneous efforts to check production in England and Ireland and a more stringent enforcement of the navigation laws.⁴¹ Most noticeable, however, were the several attempts made to secure intercolonial co-operation, beginning with the Virginia act of 1660-1661 stating that "no tobacco be planted after the last of June, provided that Maryland agreed."⁴²

³⁹ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. I, *America and the West Indies*, 1574-1660, 422-23; MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 95-104.

⁴⁰ MacInnes, *Early English Tobacco Trade*, 95-96. Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History*, IV, 14-15, says: "Over and over again local crops, chiefly in the western counties were destroyed and heavy penalties imposed, but in vain. Tobacco planting continued in England, until it gradually declined of its own accord and finally ceased altogether toward the end of the century. After 1700 we hear no more of efforts to suppress it, and from that time forward colonial tobacco, in fact as well as in law, had preferential treatment in the English market."

⁴¹ Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688* (Princeton, 1914), 117-18; Hugh E. Egerton, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy, 1606-1909* (Ninth edition: London, 1932), 60-64.

⁴² Department of Agriculture, *Control of Production of Agricultural Products*, 67.

It was probably the Navigation Act of 1660, which provided that colonial tobacco "be shipped only to England or her dominions," that precipitated the second wave and prompted Sir William Berkeley to "pray" in behalf of the planters of Virginia and Maryland in 1662 that "injunctions be given . . . the Sheriffs of this kingdom [England] to put the Act against planting tobacco in full execution and that the Governors of Maryland and Virginia have command not to permit any ship to depart from thence next year until after 1 May next."⁴³ Berkeley left for Virginia during the same year "to promote those staple Commodities of silk, hemp, flax, potashes, masts and timber for shipping which Virginia is so admirably proportioned to produce that within seven years England will not be necessitated to bring them from other countries."⁴⁴ In March, 1663, when Colonel Francis Moryson was ordered to return to England, one of his "instructions from Virginia" was "that Maryland be forced to consent to a cessation of tobacco planting."⁴⁵

On May 15, 1663, commissioners from Maryland and Virginia met pursuant to a royal order of June 29, 1662, and at this meeting Maryland asked "for a Cessacion for a year"; but the terms were rejected by Virginia.⁴⁶ The reasons for Virginia's refusal, according to Lord Baltimore, were twofold: first, the proposed plan would make it impossible for the masters "to give every one of their servants that have served out his time a years provision of corn, clothes & planting tooles," which by custom they were obliged to provide, because there would be no crop "at the end of the Cessacion yeare"; and second, a fear that as a result of "such year of Cessacion no shipping would come into those parts, and such Cessacion would be a means to force those ships which usually traded thither to seek and settle in new employments, and to engage in new waies of Trade never in probability to return thither again."⁴⁷

⁴³ "Virginia in 1662-1665," *loc. cit.*, XVIII, 409.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 423; Neill, *Virginia Carolorum*, 291.

⁴⁵ "Virginia in 1662-1665," *loc. cit.*, XVIII, 413. These instructions to Moryson are published in Neill, *Virginia Carolorum*, 308-13.

⁴⁶ *Archives of Maryland*, V, 15.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, V, 15-16.

Virginia made a counter proposal for "a stint from planting of Tobacco after the 20th day of June, every yeare," but this was rejected by the next Maryland Assembly. In an extended answer to the Virginia protests, Lord Baltimore explained that Maryland was placed at a disadvantage by such terms because it was "more northerly than Virginia," and because "the people of Maryland were uncapable of carrying on any other worke to procure a livlyhood." He also argued that the ends sought could not be attained unless the same restraint was placed upon "the West Indies to whom occasion might be given to increase their quantities, by the lessening or Cessacion imposed in Virginia and Maryland"; that royal revenues would decline; that there was no need for cessation, because the industrious planters of both Virginia and Maryland were better off "than those of their quality in England"; that "the restraining of the poor people from planting Tobacco . . . would very probably much endanger the Peace of the Province," for that was their only means of subsistence; and, finally, that the restraint would have the unwholesome effect of making "the merchants here or the more substantiall Planters there more rich," at the expense of the poorer planters who had no "stocks to engrosse."⁴⁸

Following Maryland's rejection of the proposed terms for cessation, the Virginia government appealed to England, and the resulting refusal of the Privy Council to authorize such a cessation was considered by some Virginians as "the first thing after the Restoration which would be apt to cause real disaffection."⁴⁹ The seriousness of the situation in Virginia was reflected in Berkeley's letter to the Maryland authorities concerning the desire for an agreement;⁵⁰ but the subsequent petition to the Privy Council portrayed even more clearly the desperate state of the planters. After describing the conditions which had brought the price of tobacco "to soe Low and Contemptable a Rate, that the Planter is noe way able to live by his Labour," this petition

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, V, 16-17.

⁴⁹ "Virginia in 1662-1665," *loc. cit.*, XVIII, 423; Wertebaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts*, 121-22.

⁵⁰ See letter of Sir William Berkeley and the reply of Charles Calvert, in *Archives of Maryland*, III, 476-78.

offered three proposals for remedying the situation. The first of these recommended "That some way may be thought on for the setting upon Silke, fflax, transporting Masts making Iron Pitch, and Pott Ashes," in order that the returns from these diversified industries might increase royal revenues, "Keepe great and Considerable Sums within his Dominions which yearely goes out for theis Comodities," and provide the English navy with necessities produced in the colonies. Its second suggestion was for regulation of the arrival and departure of ships engaged in the tobacco trade, and the third proposed that "the stint of dayes" be adopted for both Virginia and Maryland.⁵¹

The Virginians insisted that the stint did not place Maryland at a disadvantage because of climatic differences, as that colony had claimed. It was the "want of Raine not Sunne" that "hinders planting of Cropps there," they said, "and Raine is as frequent to the Northward as Southward." They suggested that if lack of sunshine really was the deterrent, it could have been overcome easily "by the help of hott Bedds," which, they pointed out, had been used early in England, "much more Northward than any of his Lordshipps Dominions."⁵²

Lord Baltimore's reply to the Virginia petition was made in a long statement, dated November 19, 1664, which was also presented to the Privy Council, and which apparently had the desired effect of bringing about the rejection of the Virginia proposals by that body. He began by expressing his approval of "any expedient that shalbe thought fitt to sett the Plantacion upon more staple Commodities," but he disagreed, as was to be expected, about the existing conditions and the methods proposed for their solution. He saw no relation, he said, between regulation of shipping and "lessening the quantity of Tobacco," nor did he think it reasonable to make such an experiment "at the cost of so many Masters and owners of ships and Traders to those parts"; and he re-emphasized the argument that such a program would diminish royal revenues.⁵³

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, III, 503-506.

⁵² *Ibid.*, III, 505-506.

⁵³ For the full statement, see *ibid.*, III, 506-10. Since this and the next four paragraphs constitute a summary of its argument, repetition of the citation for each quotation seems unnecessary.

To him the proposed cure seemed worse than the ailment. He insisted that for Marylanders to plant tobacco in whatever quantities they thought fit was part of "their Birthright as Englishmen," as well as the sole means for providing them with "money to buy them clothes, tooles, and all other necessities." Those who fared badly did so not because of low prices, "but from their owne sloth, ill husbandry, and profusely spending their cropps in Brandewine, and other liquors." Such as were industrious and frugal, he continued, "live in great plenty in compare to the husbandmen of England, of the same rank, and divers of them grow from nothing to great estates, and the reason is cleare for a painfull and able man will in a Summer make his four hogsheads of Tobacco which at the rate as it now is will produce in England fourteen or fifteen pound which will buy him cloathes and another servant cleare, besides which he will plant corne enough to find himself, and to sell for four or five pound more, and rear a stock of Cattle." He also predicted that "if the Merchants Warehouses [in England] should be searched a little afore new Tobacco come home it would be found that the liberty of Planting hath not swelled the quantity so much above the consumption as those Gentlemen alleadg."

Baltimore shrewdly expressed doubt as to whether the Virginia petition "for this stint was a designe, either to cause some ill reflections upon him and Maryland, as an obstruction to a pretended publique good, or else to putt a notable disadvantage upon Maryland." Had the Virginians had only the "lessening" of tobacco as their objective, "they would have embraced what was proffered" by the Maryland Assembly "about two yeares since . . . to concur with Virginia to a totall cession from planting any Tobacco at all in either Colony every third yeare which would have been a way free from all exceptions of inequality and most effectuall to the end intended." He pointed out that in reply to the Virginia proposal Maryland had suggested that she be granted "an allowance of twenty dayes . . . to plant Tobacco after the stint days in Virginia, to balance the difference of the climate," and explained that this was asked because there were "above 3 degrees of northerly

latitude distance betwixt the northern parts of Maryland and the southern parts of Virginia."

Baltimore stated that he also anticipated other difficulties if "the stinting process" was adopted. One of these was the variability and uncertainties of the planting season. Setting the stint date too early in the year might "undoe the Planter," he said, and he illustrated his point by asserting that if the stint of the preceding year had been applied beginning June 20, as the Virginians had desired, "there would have been no Tobacco planted in Maryland and perhaps not much in Virginia, for last year there was no season to any purpose in Maryland till the 20th of July." A second obstacle was likely to be the inability to convict transgressors "without either encouraging servants to inform against their Masters, or next Neighbours one against another, both which wilbe odious and dangerous for perjury and setting families in combustion both within themselves, and one against another." The only alternative to this highly undesirable system, he said, would be the appointment of officers for every county and hundred to inspect plantations before and after the stint date, "to note and number how many hills, or what portion of a field is planted." Since the plantations were "farr distant one from another," this would require "great charge and trouble and no officers wilbe found willing to undertake it without considerable salary." Even if salaries could be provided and officers appointed, there still remained the dangers of "negligence, corruption or partiality in it, as will render it ineffectuall . . . as was found by experience in a like Act in Virginia for burning Tobacco, which by this meanes came to nothing."

Turning to the Virginia suggestion that Maryland planters resort to the use of hotbeds to offset climatic difference, Baltimore branded this as both unreasonable and impracticable. "Hott beds," he pointed out, could not be used by planters who had "neither horses nor sheep, nor other means for dung to make them"; and even if they were available the tobacco raised in such manner would not be "halfe so kindly and sound." Then why, he asked, should the Maryland planters, who were almost as numerous as those of Virginia, have to undergo "that trouble

and charge"? Furthermore, if the planters of Maryland could use "hott beds to hasten their plants three weeks sooner," so could those in Virginia, and thus re-establish the disadvantage under which Maryland had to operate because of climate.

After hearing "the debates on both sides," the Privy Council recommended that the representatives of Virginia and Maryland then in London meet to frame an agreement between themselves; and when this failed it rendered a decision which rejected the Virginia proposals on the grounds that the "cessation, stint or limitation of planting Tobacco" would be inconvenient to all concerned, and that the proposed regulation of shipping would be "prejudicial both to the planters and his Majesties Customes." One slight concession was made to the plea for encouragement of diversified industry, however, in the provision that "all the Hemp, Pitch and Tarr of the growth, Production or Manufacture of Virginia and Maryland, which should be brought into this Kingdome, for the space of 5 years from the date hereof might be Custome ffree."⁵⁴

Less than two years later, however, an agreement was entered into by Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina which provided for "a Totall Cessation from planting, setting, sowing, or any waies tending Tobacco in any, or any part of all or either of the said Collonies" for the period from February 1, 1666, to February 1, 1667. Machinery for enforcing the cessation was to be provided, and justices of the peace and other public officers were to "take a Solemn oath upon the Evangelists" to execute the laws. Provisions were also made to protect members of one colony from violations committed in another, any of the three being empowered to appoint "such persons as they shall think fitt to goe into any parte of their Neighbour Collonies there to see wether the said Act bee broken or not." The officials were authorized to punish offenders "by cutting up their Tobacco either sowed, planted, sett or tended as aforesaid."⁵⁵ But this program was never put into operation because

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 510-12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 550-52.

Lord Baltimore refused to permit Maryland to become a party to the agreement.⁵⁶

In June, 1667, the Virginia governor and council petitioned the Privy Council in protest against Baltimore's refusal to approve the "articles of cessation" for Maryland, and he replied by reviewing the earlier attempts made for intercolonial co-operation between Virginia and Maryland from 1662 to 1667 and repeating the reasons for Maryland's refusal to become a party to cessation.⁵⁷ He added that Virginia, by seeking a cessation at this time, was violating the Council's order of 1664, which had "dis-allowed" its proposal for a cessation, stint, or limitation. Nor was he surprised, he said, that the councils and assemblies of both colonies, consisting "of the ablest Planters," agreed to such cessations, for that offered "the way to make them rich in one year . . . and to compell the poorer planters to enter into new servitudes to the more rich to gain subsistance."⁵⁸ Once more his arguments seem to have made a greater impression on the members of the Privy Council than did those of Virginia, and no further action was taken on the matter at that time.

The third important wave of sentiment for crop controls was inaugurated amidst a series of grievances among the Virginia planters against taxation policies and problems of imperial defense, and, accentuated by overproduction and low prices, it precipitated the "plant cutters' rebellion," second only in importance to Bacon's rebellion.⁵⁹ In 1680, the charge was made that continuous low prices would be "fatal" and would bring about the "speedy ruin" of Virginia. During the same year the King was asked that "Lord Baltimore be ordered to concur with Virginia" for a reduction of tobacco planting, and that instructions be issued for "the suing of plant-cutters," or rioters.⁶⁰ Opposition was voiced against cessation at this time, however, on the grounds that it would spur on foreign tobacco producers: "If the Virginians cease to

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 561-62.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, V, 5-9.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, V, 15-19.

⁵⁹ Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 258-59.

⁶⁰ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. X, *America and the West Indies*, 1677-1700, 568, 587.

grow it, the Spaniards, Dutch, and French will grow a greater quantity . . . and take the trade from us, to say nothing of the stimulus that would be given to the production of tobacco in England.”⁶¹

According to a report of 1681, poverty was “falling violently” on the Virginians because of “the low value” or “no value” of tobacco. There was no hope for relief unless the King “assent to a cessation of planting for one year.” It was also claimed that poverty made it impossible to engage in manufactures and checked “the erection of iron or potash works,” for which Virginia was especially suitable; and as for “other commodities producible there, such as pipestaves, timber works of all kinds, and corn,” which Virginia could produce and supply to other colonies, the great obstacle was its remote position, resulting in high freight rates that devoured “the whole produce.”⁶² This desperate plight was aggravated by a growing “closer relationship” between some of “the King’s most trusted ministers” and affairs in the colonies. A feeling of intolerance “for local autonomy and for representative institutions” had developed, but for the time being Virginia was spared from the effects of arbitrary government because of the presence there of the moderate Sir Henry Chicheley as lieutenant governor.⁶³ Lord Culpeper, the governor, had returned to England in 1680, and upon his arrival in London had “told the King that all was well in the colony”; but by October, 1681, the Privy Council had become aware of the restless spirit which was developing there, and the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations wrote Culpeper: “We are informed . . . that Virginia is in great danger of disturbance . . . by reason of extreme poverty of the people, occasioned by the low price of tobacco which, tis feared may induce the servants to plunder the Stores of the Planters and Ships arriving there and to commit other outrages and disorders as in the late rebellion.”⁶⁴

The expected disturbance was actually precipitated, however, by a series of incidents which involved both the question of royal interfer-

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, *America and the West Indies, 1681-1685*, 2.

⁶² *Ibid.*, Vol. X, *America and the West Indies, 1677-1700*, 47-48.

⁶³ Wertenbaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts*, 225; Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 259.

⁶⁴ Wertenbaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts*, 231-32.

ence in colonial government and the problem of relief for the economic situation. Ensuing correspondence between the Virginia and English authorities revealed that before leaving for England Lord Culpeper had ordered the calling of the Virginia Assembly for some time in April, 1682, by which time he had expected to return to his colony. Chicheley, as lieutenant governor, issued the writs for the convening of the Assembly, only to be instructed by the King "not to permit it to sit"; but this word came too late to cancel the meeting in advance, because the members were already on their way to James City. It was reported that "most, though not the wisest" of them had come "big with the expectation of enacting a cessation" of tobacco planting; but their efforts to meet and proceed with such legislation were abruptly quashed by the order for prorogation. Before disbanding, however, the members voted that "their journals should be publicly read by their burgesses when they got home to their respective counties," and as the word was spread "the people became inflamed, while the soldiers, by abridgement of their pay became more inclined to mutiny than to serve the king."⁶⁵

Within a short time a number of persons banded together in Gloucester County and, after destroying their own tobacco plants, went to the plantations of their neighbors and cut up their plantings. This meant, of course, the beginning of an effort to bring about "cessation" by extra-legal means,⁶⁶ and the idea quickly gained supporters. The plant cutting began on May 1 in Gloucester, and soon spread to New Kent, Middlesex, and York counties, with Robert Beverley, a planter with "a large stock of tobacco on his hands," reported as being the arch-leader who had "instilled into the multitude the idea of cutting."⁶⁷ Proclamations were immediately issued in an attempt to restore order, and the minutes of the Virginia council reveal directions for "the commanders of the various counties to call out the militia and suppress

⁶⁵ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, Vol. XI, America and the West Indies, 1681-1685*, 227-28.

⁶⁶ Neill, *Virginia Carolorum*, 395; Doyle, *English Colonies in America*, I, 261.

⁶⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, Vol. XI, America and the West Indies, 1681-1685*, 228-29.

riots." Lieutenant Governor Chicheley proclaimed a ban on "all tumultuous and riotous meetings in consequence of the disorder of the inhabitants of Gloucester County," and an order was issued for the arrest of Beverley, "who has evidently been mainly instrumental in causing the present disorders." In reporting to his superiors on the "outbreak of an insurrection in Gloucester County," Chicheley explained apologetically that "There being a large river and fifty miles of country between the rioters and me the news did not reach me for three days. We then took our measures. I suppose it is the Burgesses, big with thoughts of a cessation and yet unexpectedly pro-rogued who have blown this coal which hath inflamed the people."⁶⁸

By late May, the plant cutting had been checked considerably, and much of that which persisted went on "under the cover of night and not day." Meanwhile, planters whose tobacco had been destroyed became "possessed of the like frenzy and willingly helped . . . make his neighbor as incapable of making tobacco as he himself was." This infection spread among the women, who also "injured many of their neighbors both by day and night." The rioting was described as worst in Gloucester and New Kent, the destruction being estimated at ten thousand hogsheads. The arrest of their leaders checked the mutineers, and according to a report prepared by Culpeper a year later, "their spirits sank and their numbers dissolved; some took flight and others voluntarily submitted."⁶⁹

Perhaps the most encouraging immediate result of these disturbances was the fact that when the news of them reached England, Culpeper was ordered to return to his post in Virginia with instructions to improve the welfare of that colony, and Lord Baltimore was told to confer with him concerning the possibility of agreeing upon "such rules and instructions, about the planting of Tobacco, as shall be found most suitable to the present exigency of the place," and to co-operate in putting them into effect in both colonies.⁷⁰ Although Baltimore had

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 226-27.

⁶⁹ "Culpeper's Report on Virginia in 1683," *loc. cit.*, III, 225-38; *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XI, *America and the West Indies, 1681-1685*, 237-38.

⁷⁰ Sir Lionel Jenkins to Lord Baltimore, August 10, 1682, in *Archives of Maryland*, V, 370-71.

recently stated that "tho a cessation would be prejudicial to me, yet for a general good I shall willingly yield to it in this Province, when I understand His Majestie has left it to the Governor and Council in Virginia to act as they shall think fitt,"⁷¹ no such agreement seems to have been made, and the advocates of cessation or other restrictions still found it necessary to appeal to the authorities in England. But these developments failed to check the sentiment for restriction, for in May of the following year another petition from the Virginia council to the Lords of Trade and Plantations proposed stinting, and asked that both Maryland and Carolina be compelled to observe it. Nothing came of it. In fact, throughout the remainder of the seventeenth century and well into the next, Virginians persisted in their demands for a cessation and the English authorities continued to ignore or to deny them.⁷² In 1687, when the Privy Council received another such petition from Virginia, it "resolved that it would be better that the Assembly . . . be dissolved."⁷³

In the main, therefore, these repeated efforts to establish some form of crop control on a durable and equitable basis brought almost no tangible results, despite the fact that if there was ever a time and a crop for which conditions were favorable for controlling production to raise prices, the time was the seventeenth century and the crop was tobacco. Government controls, seemingly indispensable for such a program to function, were the rule and not the exception in that century; and the production of tobacco was confined to a relatively small area—Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina—which in turn was shielded from foreign competition by the protective wall of the British imperial system. But in this case, the program never gained sufficient official sanction for its execution, primarily, perhaps, because the interests that stood to lose from its successful operation were better organized and more vocal and influential than those for whom the benefits were intended.

⁷¹ Baltimore to William Blathwait, March 26, 1682, *ibid.*, V, 350-51.

⁷² *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XI, *America and the West Indies*, 1681-1685, 425.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, *America and the West Indies*, 1685-1688, 391, 547.

A Confederate Newspaper in Mexico

BY ALFRED J. HANNA

Five months after the close of the Civil War the press of the Mexican capital commented on the publication there of the *Mexican Times*, a weekly newspaper in English "which will advocate immigration and all constructive measures for the development of Mexico."¹ A "brilliant success" was wished for this new editorial colleague who, by repute, was a "person highly experienced politically whom the upheaval in the United States has reduced to the necessity of finding a refuge in our country."²

This new colleague in the journalistic field of Mexico, the editor of the *Mexican Times*, was the former Confederate governor of Louisiana whose administration had been sufficiently successful to merit the distinction from a notable historian as the "single great administrator produced by the Confederacy."³ He was Henry W. Allen, whose military career prior to his election to the governorship had ended with a shattered right leg and the rank of brigadier general.⁴

The immigration to Mexico advocated by the *Mexican Times* was primarily that of refugees from the South, of whom Editor Allen was one. Preferring exile to the punishment threatened by northern victory he left his high position on June 2, 1865, and started for Mexico. Penniless, he borrowed \$500 and fortified his courage by quoting Aris-

¹ *La Sociedad* (Mexico City), September 17, 1865.

² *Ibid.*, September 21, 1865.

³ Douglas S. Freeman, "Henry Watkins Allen," in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), I, 193.

⁴ Luther E. Chandler, "The Career of Henry Watkins Allen" (Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1940).

totle to the effect that "banishment is desirable, because a banished man has the choice of places in which to dwell."⁵

Allen's long, arduous, and dangerous journey from Louisiana by ambulance and horseback ended late in July at what he described as "the garden spot of this continent"—Mexico City. Within ten days he was presented at Maximilian's Court where he was told by Empress Carlota "that we poor Confederate exiles had her heartfelt sympathy, and that we were welcome in Mexico."⁶ Out of money by this time, he was forced to seek ways and means of supporting himself. Such an opportunity was found in connection with the Mexican immigration policy which was, in the summer of 1865, being evolved under Maximilian. A subsidy of 10,000 pesos was provided by the Imperial Government for the publication over a twelve-month period of a newspaper in English to popularize immigration, a responsibility Allen assumed.⁷

"I labor twelve hours every day," Allen wrote a friend in Texas as he began this work, "for I have to write all the editorials, and then see to getting up the paper. I can't afford to employ an assistant." He was handicapped by suffering from battle wounds which at times caused such serious lameness as to make it almost impossible for him to walk to his office.⁸ The limitation on expenditures was due to the fact that the subsidy of 10,000 pesos was extended over a period of twelve months. His printing staff consisted of two other Confederate refugees.⁹

⁵ Sarah A. Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry Watkins Allen* (New York, 1866), 307-10.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 331.

⁷ *Mexican Times*, January 22, 1867. It is not clear from the evidence available whether the establishment of the *Mexican Times* was Allen's idea or was the outgrowth of general plans for the encouragement of Confederate migration to Mexico. For treatments of this migration, based primarily on sources from the United States, see J. Fred Rippy, *The United States and Mexico* (New York, 1926), 247-51; Lawrence F. Hill, "The Confederate Exodus to Latin America," in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (Austin, 1897-), XXXIX (1935-1936), 100-134, 161-99; George D. Harmon, "Confederate Migration to Mexico," in *Hispanic American Historical Review* (Baltimore-Durham, 1918-), XVII (1937), 458-87; and Carl C. Rister, "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), XI (1945), 33-50.

⁸ Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry W. Allen*, 333.

⁹ Chandler, "The Career of Henry W. Allen," 240. One of these was Major John N. Edwards, who had learned typesetting in his youth.

The initial number of the *Mexican Times*, which appeared on September 16, 1865, consisted of four pages, 15½ by 21¼ inches, and was printed on the press of a French newspaper in Mexico, *L'Estafette*. The subscription rate was one dollar per month, payable in advance.¹⁰ Arrangement of "copy" in the five columns of the front page revealed Allen's inexperience. One-half column was properly devoted to a general statement of purpose and plan, but two and one-half columns were given over to a historical discussion of Mexico for the years 1789-1794, a subject possessing not the remotest news value. The only real news included was a register of immigrants from the United States.

Page two contained an able editorial on the policy of the *Mexican Times*, one-half column on learning Spanish, and in three columns was announced Maximilian's decree by which Mexico was opened to the world for immigration. From the standpoint of news importance this article should have been placed on the front page. On page three were domestic and foreign news, items about theatres and other public amusements, lists of newspapers published in Mexico, banks, railroad and steamship schedules, a one-column article on the proposed Vera Cruz to Mexico City railroad, a curious article on rain, and advertisements of saloons, hotels, and other business establishments. Among later hotel advertisements was one of the "Confederate Hotel, largest two-story house in . . . [Cordoba]."¹¹

Two "fillers" made up the fourth and last page. One was a brief article on heraldry; the other was a dull, long-drawn-out discussion of the Mexican Empire and the United States by Francis J. Parker, "late colonel of the 32d Massachusetts Infantry, United States Army."

As outlined in Allen's first editorial, the chief purpose of the *Mexican Times* was to advocate "immigration and progress in their fullest meaning and extent. . . . We shall urge with all our influence, emigrants from the United States and Europe who wish rich, productive,

¹⁰ A file (with only two numbers missing) of the *Mexican Times* is in the Louisiana State University Library, an examination of which has produced this study. The only other known copies are a few numbers possessed by the New York Historical Society. Not a single issue was available (in 1944) in any public depository in Mexico.

¹¹ *Mexican Times*, September 3, 1866.

and cheap lands, to come to this country without delay and accept the very liberal offers now made by the Imperial Government." His enticing word picture of the opportunities awaiting immigrants was, in part, as follows:

Come and settle where you can grow sugar-cane, coffee, indigo, cotton, cacao, and tobacco, with all the tropical fruits. Come where the climate is an eternal spring and where, strange to say, there are no fevers—no epidemics of any kind, except in the tierra caliente of the seacoast. Bring with you, your engineers and mechanics, and such implements of husbandry as may serve as patterns for others. Here you will find iron, steel, copper, and timber all ready to be turned into such utensils as you may want. The more precious metals—the silver and the gold—are here in great abundance, awaiting the reward of your industry and enterprise. . . . The best article of cotton is grown in every part of the Empire—the sea-island being very productive on the Gulf and Pacific coasts. . . . The lands in the tierra templada yield large crops of Indian corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, and potatoes, which always find a good market at the door. The tobacco planters are making fortunes—the coffee and cacao haciendas are still more productive, yielding large profits to their owners.¹²

This message was directed to the United States, England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, and France. To disaffected Confederates the following appeal was made:

To those in the United States whose fortunes have been swept away by the terrible tempest that has so long raged in that afflicted land, to those who have drunk the cup of bitterness to the very dregs, we say, come to Mexico. Here you can get homes without money and without price. Here you will find a shelter as did the Huguenots who fled to England, as did the Puritans who came to the bleak shores of America. . . . The fortunes which you have lost can be regained here by a few years of industry and enterprise. Come then, and bring with you your families and your household goods. Let the maid and matron, the aged sire, the tender son, and hired servants—all come.¹³

Stress was placed on the full guarantee of liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship under Maximilian, who was described as a liberal, "republican emperor." The editorial concluded with the over-optimistic statement that the destiny of Mexico was fixed, that the "Empire is an accomplished fact."¹⁴

¹² *Ibid.*, September 16, 1865.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

The format of the first number was followed, generally, in succeeding numbers except that beginning with the second issue and continuing thereafter at least one-half column on the front page was dedicated to poetry of a sentimental nature. Subsequent editorials urged immigration, the development of agriculture, the building of railroads, industries, and internal improvements. Attention, as promised, was also given to "the arts and sciences, to polite literature, and to the general news of the day, foreign and domestic." Except for items concerned with the arrival of Confederates and their settlement domestic news was restricted to official announcements and theatrical happenings. Foreign news was, on the whole, well selected. Considerable statistical material, some of it of value, was run. In the third issue four columns on the front page were used for the reproduction of a chapter from *Oliver Twist* by Dickens. Also in the third issue was a brief denial of the rumor that General Sterling Price, former governor of Missouri who had settled in Mexico, would lead an army of Confederates against the Federal forces assembled on the Texas side of the Rio Grande under General Philip H. Sheridan.¹⁵ In the fourth issue was reproduced a long attack by the London *Daily Telegraph* on the United States policy toward the South.¹⁶

The successful publication of five issues apparently convinced Allen that the *Mexican Times* had been built on solid foundations and led him to declare that it was a "proved success." Confidence in its future was further expressed by extending the length of the paper three inches and the width two inches, and by acknowledging receipt of a "long list of subscribers from Orizaba and Cordoba, all marked paid. . . . The *Times* is daily receiving fresh evidence of approbation from the good people of Mexico."¹⁷ Outside of Mexico recognition of Allen's work was also noted in a comment from the New York *Times* which said: "[The *Mexican Times*] is full of that intelligence, enthusiasm, spirit,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, September 30, 1865.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, October 7, 1865.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, October 14, 1865.

and loftiness of tone which are eminently characteristic of its gallant and distinguished editor."¹⁸

A column of humor was introduced later, the first of which was a story of a drunken Negro in the United States who was planning to "wherp out Maximillum, and den cum back hure and whup dese yankees." An editorial in this issue asserted that immigration was progressing so happily that Mexico could look forward to the not distant day when with 20,000 "good and intelligent immigrants from Europe and the United States . . . there will be no longer any use for French soldiers" to help Maximilian maintain law and order.¹⁹

For almost two years prior to the establishment of the *Mexican Times* the French newspaper, *L'Estafette*, official organ of Marshal François Achille Bazaine in Mexico,²⁰ had endeavored to convince Mexicans that their security and prosperity depended on drawing to their country at least 600,000 immigrants, preferably from Europe. This idea, which was attributed to Napoleon III, was presumably based on the observation that the chief source of strength for the United States had been the more than 2,500,000 British, Irish, Germans, and other Europeans who had emigrated there in the decade preceding the Civil War.²¹ As a forum for the discussion of immigration *L'Estafette* had exerted every possible effort to stimulate throughout Mexico interest in this subject. When on September 5, 1865, Maximilian gave his full support to the French proposals for immigration he appointed a distinguished Confederate refugee, the scientist Matthew F. Maury, Imperial Commissioner of Immigration and General John B. Magruder head of the Land Office.²² The *Mexican Times* became, therefore, the officially subsidized mouthpiece of the immigration officials and in the

¹⁸ Quoted in *Mexican Times*, November 18, 1865.

¹⁹ *Mexican Times*, October 21, 1865. For terms of the Convention of Miramar, by which the French army was aiding Maximilian, see G. Niox, *Expedition du Mexique, 1861-67* (Paris, 1874), 743-45.

²⁰ Eugène Lefèvre, *Documents Officiels Recueillis dans la Secrétairerie Privée de Maximilian*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1869), I, 336.

²¹ James Truslow Adams (ed.), *Dictionary of American History*, 5 vols. (New York, 1940), III, 75.

²² *Decrees for the Encouragement of Immigration and Colonization* (Mexico City, 1865).

formulation of its policy Editor Allen was intimately associated with Maury and his close friend Magruder. In line with his specific responsibility to interest Confederates in Mexico, Allen answered the question "Why are there any Confederates in Mexico?" as follows:

These gallant and distinguished gentlemen now in Mexico were told that they would be arrested and cast into a loathsome prison, there to be held for future humiliation and punishment. A reward in the public newspapers had already been offered for one of them. The Governors east of the Mississippi River had been seized and although one of them had been most terribly wounded, still they were all thrust into the felon's cell. Those gentlemen who lived mostly in the Trans-Mississippi Department reasonably expected the same treatment. They were, therefore, driven out from their native land, from their homes and firesides, their wives and children, and sought a shelter in Mexico, the only place of retreat left to them.²³

Having thus clarified the causes for emigration from the South, the *Mexican Times* proceeded to discuss its advocacy of "this great" and "patriotic enterprize" in Mexico. First, immigration would destroy absenteeism, "the most ruinous system that has ever cursed the agricultural interests of any country." Second, immigrants would drive away robbers, hence they would guarantee security. Third, the newcomers would create a greatly needed middle class which "in time of peace does the producing, and in time of war does the fighting."²⁴

In answer to criticisms that land was not available, the *Mexican Times* declared that "newspapers of the Empire are filled with propositions from eager landholders to sell or lease a portion of their lands on the most reasonable terms," that "millions of acres" were already being offered by private individuals and the Government. Allen dismissed as untrue the alleged opposition of Mexicans to immigration and compared it with the Native American party in the United States

²³ *Mexican Times*, November 11, 1865. By the end of July, 1865, it was estimated (see *La Sociedad*, July 19, 26, 28, 1865) that 4,000 Confederate refugees had reached Monterrey and that slightly less than that number were at the border. These estimates were considerably in excess of the actual number. A census compiled by the writer of this article lists less than 1,000 Confederates who migrated to Mexico during 1865-1867.

²⁴ *Mexican Times*, November 18, 1865.

which had used the argument of "America for Americans," and this "political clap-trap" had soon been swept away by common sense.²⁵

Until December 20, 1865, the *Mexican Times* was printed from the press of *L'Estafette*. On that date, three months after his paper was started, Allen purchased a press and, beginning with the fifteenth issue, published the *Mexican Times* from his combination office and residence at No. 8 Calle de Cordobanes.²⁶ This sanctum became the virtual headquarters for all Confederates who came to the Mexican capital.²⁷

With the beginning of the new year of 1866 the *Mexican Times* announced that every steamer from the United States was bringing letters of inquiry about Mexico, the majority of which were from Georgia, Tennessee, Texas, and Louisiana. An editorial gave these inquirers assurance that the Empire was firmly established, that within twelve months Mexico would be "perfectly quiet," that all professions and occupations were open except those for merchants, doctors, lawyers, and clergymen, that society was very agreeable (one could go to church in the morning, attend a bullfight in the afternoon, and hear an opera at night), and that the trip to Mexico should be made by steamer from New Orleans to Vera Cruz or to Havana and thence to Vera Cruz or some other Gulf port. "To sum up our advice," wrote Allen, "we say this is the finest country on the face of God's earth, and presents the best openings for comfortable homes and large fortunes for those who have a small capital on which to begin; but to those who are without means we say, in all candor, stay where you are."²⁸

²⁵ *Ibid.* Allen was undoubtedly too optimistic about the availability of lands for immigrants. The editor of *L'Estafette*, who had ardently supported immigration at the beginning of the Maximilian regime, had grown cynical by the fall of 1865, and he warned Allen and other Confederates not to be misled by surface hospitality. He wrote: "The yearning of the [Mexican] population for immigration is not keen If we combined the opinions on this subject, put out by the majority of the national press, it would be very easy for us to prove that foreign immigration, far from being desired or solicited, will find few hacienda doors open, few tables waiting, and few cordial welcomes from one end of Mexico to the other." *L'Estafette*, November 9, 1865.

²⁶ *Mexican Times*, January 22, 1867.

²⁷ Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry W. Allen*, 340.

²⁸ *Mexican Times*, January 27, 1866. For a change in Allen's attitude, compare this

Confederate refugees who continued to enter Mexico were welcomed as "battle-wrecked pilgrims to a new shrine." According to reports of their arrival, some "have families with them, some have stock and farming utensils, and all have the determination to go to work somewhere and make good and loyal supporters of the Empire."²⁹ In the middle of February, 1866, the *Mexican Times* reported that "during the past week our city has been alive with Americans who, as the warm spring days come back, concentrate here before going into final business." It was also noted that "papers of the United States are teeming with accounts of people . . . coming to Mexico."³⁰

In order to counteract the widespread opposition in the United States to French intervention by which the Maximilian government had been created, Allen wrote an editorial in which he bluntly called the Monroe Doctrine "a bloated humbug." His argument began with the statement that the largest portion of the Western Hemisphere was under the sovereignty of three monarchies other than Mexico; namely, Great Britain, Russia, and Brazil. He declared that when Iturbide had become Emperor of Mexico no serious criticism had arisen in the United States. He then asked, "Why this new born zeal for the Monroe Doctrine which has long since exploded, and which no two men understand alike in the United States?" His answer was that its protagonists were politicians, would-be filibusters, and holders of the Juárez government bonds in the United States.³¹ His belief was that the "gas bag" of the Monroe Doctrine would be punctured by the good sense of the people of the United States who, moreover, "do not imagine themselves as heaven born propagandists of republican principles all the wide world over." He reminded his readers that the "self-constituted

statement with that of September 16, 1865: "Here you can get homes without money and without price."

²⁹ *Ibid.*, January 27, 1866.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, February 17, 1866.

³¹ "The bonds of the \$30,000,000 loan now put in circulation in New York by the agents of Juarez are of very handsome appearance. The vignette represents a female holding a streamer upon a map of North America, designated upon a globe draped by the colors of the United States. In the background is a group of buildings of the Spanish American style of architecture shaded by tropical trees. On the left is President Lincoln's portrait; on the right, that of Juarez." *Mexican Times*, November 18, 1865.

dictators" of South American republics were "much worse than kings and emperors."³² Continuing his attack he quoted from a message of Governor Charles Anderson of Ohio as follows:

What the Monroe Doctrine exactly is, we have never agreed among ourselves. . . . Its purpose was uncertain. . . . Its means are, to this day, unspecified. . . . We are asked to go to war with France, or to menace and bully her in behalf of Mexico. . . . It is very true that neither France nor Austria has any business in Mexico. But the answer is very plain—"no more have we!"³³

Good, cheap, and reliable labor was promised planters. In this announcement it was frankly explained that the Asiatic Colonization Company would import Chinese "coolies" who would be "furnished subscribers very cheap, and belong to them with certain restrictions for a certain period."³⁴

Slightly more than seven months after the first appearance of the *Mexican Times*, Allen died. He had been seriously ill only a short time, although for three years he had seldom been released from the pain caused by wounds and exposure in the Civil War.³⁵ Among tributes paid him was one from a Mexico City editor who described him as a highly esteemed and respected southern emigré whose editorship of the *Mexican Times* had honored Mexico.³⁶ Even the unfriendly *New York Evening Post* had admitted two months prior to Allen's death that he had made of his paper "a really sprightly, readable sheet, far ahead of the clumsy, lumbering native journals."³⁷

"This paper will be faithfully continued, and the wishes of its late editor carried out to their fullest extent," wrote the new editor, Major John N. Edwards,³⁸ in the next issue. "There shall be no relaxation

³² *Ibid.*, February 17, 1866.

³³ *Ibid.*, March 3, 1866.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, April 14, 1866. Allen carefully avoided references to the proposed introduction of Negro labor into Mexico which provoked a storm of disapproval in the United States.

³⁵ Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry W. Allen*, 337, 364.

³⁶ *L'Estafette*, April 25, 1866.

³⁷ *New York Evening Post*, February 1, 1866.

³⁸ John Newman Edwards (1839-1889) was brigade adjutant with the rank of major on the staff of General Joseph O. Shelby, with whom he went to Mexico. While there he gathered material for his *Shelby's Expedition to Mexico* (Kansas City, 1872). In

of its advocacy of immigration; no falling off from its position upon internal improvements, and progress; and no abatement of its love and devotion to the Empire."³⁹ The last wish and provision of Allen also included the appointment of another intimate friend, General John B. Magruder, as business manager.⁴⁰ Four months later Edwards assumed entire control of the establishment and from September 16, 1866, to November of that year obtained from the Maximilian government a subsidy of \$150 monthly.⁴¹

Under the editorship of Edwards, whose literary talents and newspaper experience were superior to those of Allen, the *Mexican Times* was improved in the phrasing of its editorials but, probably because of lack of help, its format suffered somewhat. Edwards worked faithfully and consistently for immigration, even though his was ordinarily the only enthusiastic endorsement of that project. Considerable space was given to accounts of imprisoned Confederates; in two issues almost a page each described the Jefferson Davis case.

Early in October, 1866, in publicizing the Emperor's decree giving certain rights and lands in the Department of Tuxpan for colonization purposes, Edwards found an opportunity to praise his former Civil War commander, General Joseph O. Shelby, who was placed in charge of a colony in Tuxpan. "Colonization, unfortunately, mismanaged at first," wrote Edwards, "comes back again to the vision upon the horizon of Mexico and when Shelby . . . and others of similar energy and intelligence put their shoulders to the wheels, success is easy."⁴²

1868 he helped found the *Kansas City Times*, of which he was editor at the time of his death. Of Edwards the *Kansas City Star* of May 4, 1889, said: "He was one of the most commanding figures in the West. He was a writer of remarkable vigor, and his style was so picturesque as to invest his work with a thoroughly distinctive quality. He possessed a dramatic power of description which will live in several volumes of war literature which he has left as mementos of his genius." See also, Mary V. Edwards (comp.), *John N. Edwards: Biography, Memoirs, Reminiscences, and Recollections* (Kansas City, 1889).

³⁹ *Mexican Times*, April 28, 1866.

⁴⁰ Magruder's wife was related to the British minister to Mexico. See Alexander W. Terrell, *From Texas to Mexico and the Court of Maximilian in 1865* (Dallas, 1933), 40.

⁴¹ Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry W. Allen*, 363, and *Mexican Times*, January 22, 1867.

⁴² *Mexican Times*, October 8, 1866.

One of the strongest editorials written by Edwards was an analysis of Mexican relations with the United States which contained a warning against the danger of aggression of the republic to the north. In part it ran:

North American insolence and aggression may become insufferable. Mr. Seward's menace of Austria and the rest of the world, General Sheridan's hatred of emigration, General Weitzel's conduct on the Rio Grande, and various other marked unfriendly acts show that the chronic bullying of that party has not exhausted itself, and that the only question is how far it will be carried unless speedily checked. Napoleon III is a far-seeing and sagacious sovereign, but the mistake of his reign was in not fighting the battles of Mexico in Virginia, and guarding the line of the Rio Grande by holding the fords of the Potomac. . . . Suppose the French do go, suppose the Imperial dynasty is ended, and after all the Yankees come. Then what? They will penetrate every town, hacienda, and city; they will seize the reins of government and fill every position with men of accommodating views and morals; the Indians will be colonized in narrow limits and legislated into eternity. Every mine will be penetrated and exhausted; squatters will swarm over every hacienda and argue or drive the true owners away in despair; national customs and habits will be derided; religion scoffed at; the traditions of the people mocked; every avenue of enterprize and every source of wealth will be choked and grappled by a vast, eager, rushing multitude. . . . America, as represented by the Radical party has drank so much human blood that her thirst is hot and angry. . . . Somewhere some time ago we saw a map of the United States which included Canada, Mexico, Central America, St. Domingo, and Jamaica. . . . Why can't France, England, and Mexico meet the Yankee as well now as twenty years hence when he shall have paid his enormous debt, finished the destruction of the South, centralized his tremendous power, and filled the ocean with iron clads? Don't be afraid and suspicious and jealous of the poor, ill-starred Confederates. Their cup of bitterness is running over; they are groaning and suffering under oppressions hateful and unendurable and before Napoleon withdraws from Mexico, let him ask how many of Lee's or Jackson's men would join a French column landed at New Orleans or Charleston.⁴³

Six months later Edwards asserted that the *New York Times* was advocating a United States protectorate over Mexico, that the *New York Herald* openly demanded annexation and absorption, and that a dozen other papers in the United States, more or less influential, were "eager and clamorous for the Americans to swallow up this un-

⁴³ *Ibid.*, May 19, 1866.

fortunate country." He urged Mexicans to support Maximilian as the only solution to their critical problem.⁴⁴

With the discontinuance on November 1, 1866, of the government subsidy, Edwards was able to continue publication of the *Mexican Times* for only three more numbers after that date, and concluded his editorship with the issue of November 19. In the next number he announced:

We have disposed of the *Mexican Times* and all interests connected with it. Mr. Ford C. Barksdale has assumed the duties of the Editorial department, and we can promise our readers that the paper under his direction will be a first class newspaper. Mr. Barksdale has been connected with some of the largest journals in the world as correspondent for years and has all the requisite ability to conduct a first class paper.⁴⁵

The passing of the *Mexican Times* with the issue of December 4, 1866, to the control and direction of Barksdale marked the elimination of Confederate influences. The new editorial policy disavowed any endorsement of Confederate migration to Mexico; furthermore, it assumed an attitude toward the future of Mexico devoid of any particular support of Maximilian.

Barksdale, the new editor, had been in Mexico three years.⁴⁶ In one of the early issues of the *Mexican Times* he had run a half-column advertisement of the Universal Book Agency and American News Company, of which he was listed as proprietor and director.⁴⁷ On October 7, 1865, he became the sole agent of the *Mexican Times* and was commended by Allen "as well recommended for his great promptness and energy as a business man."⁴⁸ In the announcement of his purchase of the paper, Barksdale wrote that in October, 1865, there were only 38 paying subscribers, that in January, 1866, there were 137, and that at

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, November 5, 1866.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, December 4, 1866. Barksdale's given name appears variously as Ford C., Bradford C., and B. C., in the *Mexican Times* and other contemporary sources. It has not been possible to obtain information on his activities before he went to Mexico.

⁴⁶ *Mexican Times*, December 4, 1866.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, September 30, 1865.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, October 7, 1865.

the time of his purchase the number of subscribers had been reduced to 46.⁴⁹

In his first issue Barksdale abruptly reversed the editorial policy from subsidized support of the Empire to disapproval of the form of government it represented. In a long discussion entitled "Abdication" he prophesied that Maximilian would abdicate and declared that the "vast majority of the Mexican people are determined to forever resist the establishment of a monarchy on their soil."⁵⁰

Barksdale's first criticism of Confederate immigration was directed at the former Imperial Commissioner of Immigration as follows:

The attempt made last year under Mr. Maury to promote colonization on a large scale, proved . . . abortive, mainly because it was controlled by incompetency, and conducted in utter defiance of common sense and with not much regard for truth and common honesty. Its failure seemed for a time to have completely discredited and put an end to all attempts to introduce American settlers into Mexico.⁵¹

Endorsement was given, however, to two colonization projects "where peace and order could readily be maintained because a sparse population furnished no materials to disturb them, and where the proximity of the coast, with navigable rivers to the healthy high lands, secured that indispensable stimulus of immigration, cheap transportation, and rendered government expenditure to aid it wholly unnecessary."⁵² These two colonies were directed by Shelby on the Tuxpan River, emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and Eustace Barron on the Santiago River, running into the Pacific Ocean. In praise of them Barksdale wrote: "We know of no better place where our friends can enrich themselves so speedily in agricultural pursuits as on these lands. The land is scarcely equaled in richness. The climate is the poet's ideal of a Paradise, and an immensely valuable property is at the disposition of all who choose to improve the opportunity."⁵³

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, January 22, 1867.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, December 4, 1866.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, December 11, 1866.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, January 1, 1867.

Barksdale's first full explanation of his new editorial policy appeared late in January, 1867, after he had been at the helm almost two months. He announced that since he had assumed an independent course the circulation had increased to 427 subscribers, less than a dozen of whom were outside of Mexico City, that no subsidy was desired from the government, and emphasized the need for a free press. As to the future, he wrote:

The *Mexican Times* will advocate peace. Educational, agricultural, mineral, and public improvements will be endorsed and no official high or low will be asked what we may or may not say. It no longer employs its columns to call Juarez a half-blood Indian and the Liberals brigands and thieves. Neither does it waste ink and space in declaiming upon the regal titles of any power. It will not invite American to "come to Mexico," merely to accomplish the ends of some enthusiastic speculator. When solid and advantageous terms are secured to immigrants by responsible and able parties, then we will say "come."⁵⁴

From his other writings it became clear that Barksdale was loyal to the United States Government and did not deny the assertion of the Mexico City *Patria* that he was an "intimate friend of the New York Herald."⁵⁵ In addition to the *Patria*, the *Pajaro Verde* also condemned the new policy of the *Mexican Times* as inconsequential and a "sad example."⁵⁶ Under the new management the *Mexican Times* carried more favorable news from the United States, more advertisements, and less poetry. The additional income resulted in the publication as a semi-weekly instead of, as heretofore, a weekly. The new rate was eight dollars annually. At this time Barksdale estimated that he had at least 1,000 readers, the majority of whom were merchants, including all American and English houses, and all Germans and Mexicans in the capital who read English.⁵⁷ Nine days following this optimistic announcement the *Mexican Times* was sold to R. J. Percy, though Barksdale apparently remained as editorial writer.⁵⁸

Henceforth the *Mexican Times* resumed its support of Maximilian

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, January 22, 1867.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, December 11, 1866.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, February 4, 1867.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, February 13, 1867. No further information about Percy has been found.

and grew bitter against the French, as is indicated by the following: "It is not against Maximilian or against Monarchy that the vast majority of Mexicans are now fighting but against the immense French debt. Repudiate the whole French debt, and two-thirds of the Liberal army would be disbanded at once. . . . Bazaine was the curse before and behind the throne, the executioner of the Empire who always stood over it with uplifted battle axe determined that it should accomplish nothing."⁵⁹

By the end of March, 1867, the *Mexican Times* was begging Mexicans to strengthen their support of Maximilian. Actually at that time the Juárez forces were in full control of the larger part of Mexico, yet an editorial announced that the "Republic of Mexico is no more, and the Liberal Army is powerless. If the Republic is resurrected, it will be either by the American interference or by a vote of the people of Mexico."⁶⁰

Despite its warm support of the Empire the *Mexican Times* was suspended for five issues and its editor placed in prison because of an error in reporting. It was reported in the issue of April 25 that a diplomatic conference was held between a semi-official agent of the Imperial government and General Porfirio Diaz, who was in command of the Juárez forces near Mexico City. The publication of this story fanned the rumor that the Imperial and Juárez forces were discussing a peace settlement, and this was bitterly resented by General Leonardo Marquez, who disciplined the *Mexican Times*. As was explained when the paper resumed publication, the meeting which gave rise to the offending story was between the secretary of the Emperor, who, with a wealthy foreign merchant, conferred with Diaz on "private and particular business."⁶¹

The *Mexican Times* continued publication until June 17, 1867, two days prior to the execution of Maximilian at Queretaro. So chaotic were conditions, however, that it was not known, or if known not ad-

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, February 23, 1867.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, March 31, 1867.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, April 25 and May 16, 1867.

mitted, at the time the final issue went to press that the Emperor had been defeated, tried, and was awaiting execution. In it the hope was expressed that Maximilian would return to the capital by July 1. The overwhelming complexity of the Mexican situation was indicated, however, in the following lines from the last issue of that unique newspaper which had mirrored the rise and fall of the Confederate migration to Mexico: "Incomprehensible, unfathomable, intangible, and unnatural Mexico! Neither can foreigners, nor can yourselves understand the people that populate your land."⁶²

⁶² *Ibid.*, June 17, 1867.

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer

BY JAMES W. PATTON

As announced in the May issue of the *Journal*, the Association deferred to the requests of the Office of Defense Transportation and the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce by cancelling plans for an annual meeting in 1945.

A called meeting of the Executive Council was held at the Piedmont Hotel in Atlanta on the evening of November 10. At this time Professor William C. Binkley presented and the Council accepted an offer on the part of Vanderbilt University to continue its sponsorship of the *Journal of Southern History* for a period of five years beginning January 1, 1946. Under this arrangement the University will continue to provide the editorial staff, consisting of a managing editor and an editorial associate, both of whom shall be acceptable to the Association; will continue to provide the necessary secretarial assistance, office facilities, and expenses incidental thereto; and will pay for the printing, wrapping, and mailing of one issue of the *Journal* each year.

A report from Professor Alfred J. Hanna, chairman of the Committee on Endowment and Publications, was received, and the committee was instructed to continue its work. The expenditure of \$100.00 was authorized for postage and secretarial work in the interest of the committee's objectives; and a fund of \$500.00 was appropriated for an exploratory study of what needs to be done in the way of research in southern history, on condition that an equal amount for this purpose be secured from one of the Foundations. The chairman of the committee was empowered to suggest replacements and to nominate successors to the committee as competent additions are found available,

these suggestions and nominations to be made to the Executive Council of the Association.

The Council considered and approved a proposed plan for co-operation with business firms in establishing research fellowships or grants-in-aid for promoting historical studies of various types of business concerns in the southern region. A special committee, consisting of Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky, chairman, Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, and Frank L. Owsley, Vanderbilt University, was named to formulate definite plans for the implementation and administration of such a program.

The Managing Editor nominated and the Council elected William B. Hamilton of Duke University and Henry T. Shanks of Birmingham-Southern College as members of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History* for four-year terms, 1946-1949. Upon receipt of a renewed invitation from Birmingham-Southern College, it was voted to hold the 1946 annual meeting of the Association in Birmingham, Alabama, as was originally planned for 1945.

The Secretary was instructed to submit by mail to the membership of the Association a slate of nominees prepared by the Committee on Nominations, and upon the basis of the results received to cast the ballot of the Association for officers for the ensuing year. As a result of this procedure the following were elected: vice-president, 1946, Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky; secretary-treasurer, 1946, James W. Patton, North Carolina State College; members of the Executive Council, 1946-1948, J. Harold Easterby, College of Charleston, and Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University. By provision of the Constitution the present vice-president of the Association, Miss Ella Lonn of Goucher College, automatically succeeds to the presidency for 1946.

On December 31, 1944, the Association had an active membership of 870. Since that date 12 members have resigned and 18 have been dropped for non-payment of dues after remaining in arrears for twelve months. Seven have been removed by death: Victor V. Aderholdt, Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina; Alex M. Arnett, The

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina; Mrs. Henry Ellsworth Bemis, Palm Beach, Florida; William B. Everett, III, Dickerson, Maryland; Hunter D. Farish, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, Williamsburg, Virginia; Ike H. Moore, director of the San Jacinto Museum of History, San Jacinto Monument, Texas, before entering the armed service where he was killed in action; and Alto L. Whitehurst, University of Alabama, University, Alabama. As against this loss of 37, one hundred and nine new members have been secured, and seven previously inactive have been restored to active affiliation. This makes a net gain of 79 and a total active membership of 949. Fourteen of these are life members, this number having been increased by three during the current year. There is also an exchange list of 72, making a grand total of 1,021. Of the active members, 28 are still in arrears for 1945 dues.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

December 31, 1945

Balance as of January 1, 1945:

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds,	
Series D, @ \$750.00	\$ 5,250.00
Interest accrued but not collected,	
1940-1944	630.00
3 U. S. Savings Bonds,	
Series F, @ \$740.00	2,220.00
Interest accrued but not collected,	
1942-1944	56.00
	<hr/>
Total investments	\$ 8,156.00
Checking account, Wachovia Bank	
and Trust Company, Raleigh,	
North Carolina	1,854.44
	<hr/>
Total	\$10,010.44

Receipts, January 1 through December 31, 1945:

Annual dues collected	\$ 3,659.80
Sale of extra copies, back files, and reprints, <i>Journal of Southern History</i>	261.17
Life memberships	150.00
Interest on Savings Bonds, accrued but not collected	185.00
	<hr/>
Total receipts	\$ 4,255.97
	<hr/>
Total to be accounted for.....	\$14,266.41

Disbursements, January 1 through December 31, 1945:

Printing:

<i>Journal of Southern History</i> , Feb- ruary and May issues	\$ 1,214.03
Title page and index, 1944	97.66
Contributors' reprints	371.29
Membership committee materials	22.17
Stationery and supplies	9.58
Bank charges	7.60
Express charges	81.91
Refund on overpaid account	3.00
Executive committee expense	14.50
Postage	73.51
Secretary's stipend	500.00
	<hr/>
Total disbursements	\$ 2,395.25
	<hr/>
Balance as of January 1, 1946	\$11,871.16

ANALYSIS OF BALANCE

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds, Series D, @ \$750.00	\$ 5,250.00	
Interest accrued but not collected, 1940-1945	770.00	
5 U. S. Savings Bonds, Series F, @ \$740.00	3,700.00	
Interest accrued but not collected, 1942-1945	101.00	
	<hr/>	
Total investments		\$ 9,821.00
Checking account, Wachovia Bank and Trust Company, Raleigh, North Carolina		2,050.16
		<hr/>
Total		\$11,871.16

Notes and Documents

MR. JEFFERSON PREPARES AN ITINERARY

EDITED BY ELIZABETH COMETTI

Was Thomas Jefferson a "Philistine" in his cultural outlook? Almost, charges Gilbert Chinard.¹ By no means, is the verdict of James Truslow Adams.² Since both authors base their conclusions on the same evidence, a re-examination of an important part of it might serve to illuminate, if not to reconcile, their divergent points of view. According to Professor Chinard, the most "damning" documentary evidence is found in some traveling notes which Jefferson scribbled "very hastily and undigested" for the benefit of John Rutledge, Jr., and Thomas Lee Shippen, two young Americans who were starting on a grand tour of western Europe in the summer of 1788.³ More recently, Claude G. Bowers cites this material as representing Jefferson's "own well-defined ideas of travel, particularly for an American of that period."⁴

None of the published collections of Jefferson's writings which include the notes quoted at length by the controversialists has reproduced the entire manuscript, of which the published notes form only the central part.⁵ The omission is unfortunate, for by detaching this central

¹ Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson, the Apostle of Americanism* (Boston, 1939), 164-75.

² James Truslow Adams, *The Living Jefferson* (New York, 1936), 181-85.

³ Jefferson to John Rutledge, Jr., June 19, 1788, in Albert E. Bergh (ed.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington, 1903), VII, 50-52; Jefferson to Thomas L. Shippen, June 19, 1788, *ibid.*, 52-54.

⁴ Claude G. Bowers, *The Young Jefferson, 1743-1789* (Boston, 1945), 410-11.

⁵ Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, XVII, 290-93; Philip S. Foner (ed.), *Basic Writings of*

part, which consists of generalizations, from the context, which is specific, practical, and personal, one is apt to lose sight of the motive which prompted Jefferson to write the travel guide for his visiting compatriots. As Dr. Adams very properly points out, to "understand them [the notes], we must recall the nature of the tour to be taken."⁶ Both of the travelers were connected with the first families of the South and would eventually come into large estates. Both, in line with family tradition, were preparing themselves for political careers. Shippen, who was studying law at the Inner Temple, was the son of Dr. William Shippen of Philadelphia and the nephew of Richard Henry and Arthur Lee of Virginia.⁷ Somewhat limited in funds, the young man thus sought to justify an extension of his travels:

My good friend Mr. Jefferson agreed most perfectly with Mr. Adams that in all events I should visit Italy—supposing with that gentleman that both on account of the classical and agricultural scenes with which I should then become familiar the journey would be extremely delightful and highly beneficial. In this persuasion he prepared for me with great pains a long itinerary, specifying all ye objects which would present themselves on my journey worthy my attentions, and also the rout I should take, with the time proper to be passed at each place which I should come to.⁸

Rutledge was the son of Governor John Rutledge and the nephew of Edward Rutledge, two of the greatest landowners and political figures in South Carolina, with both of whom Jefferson was corresponding on agricultural and political topics.⁹ At the express wish of the elder Rutledges, the object of the proposed journey was essentially utilitarian, and knowing this, Jefferson would have been remiss in his role of cicerone had he failed to point out the more practical items of interest, particularly in those regions whose soil and climate found duplication

Thomas Jefferson (New York, 1944), 309-10; H. A. Washington (ed.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 9 vols. (New York, 1853-1854), IX, 403-405.

⁶ Adams, *The Living Jefferson*, 182.

⁷ Archibald B. Shepperson, *John Paradise and Lucy Ludwell* (Richmond, 1942), 246-48.

⁸ Thomas L. Shippen to Dr. William Shippen, August 13, 1788, in Shippen Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁹ Jefferson to Edward Rutledge, July 14, 1787, in Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, VI, 169-73, and July 18, 1788, *ibid.*, VII, 79-82; Jefferson to Governor John Rutledge, August 6, 1787, *ibid.*, VI, 250-52.

in the South. "Italy," Jefferson wrote Governor Rutledge, "is a field where the inhabitants of the Southern States may see much to copy in agriculture, and a country with which we shall carry on considerable trade."¹⁰ Therefore he advised the son to note the cultivation and processing of rice, the preparation of Parmesan cheese, the Lombard method of storing snow, and the gardens which exhibited a "very rare mixture" of utility and beauty. In southern France young Rutledge was to inspect the cultivation and the various species of dried raisins and figs because these "could not fail to succeed in S. Carolina." Whenever the proposed itinerary took the travelers through regions not visited by Jefferson, he wished them to make observations which might not only prove beneficial to themselves, but might also supplement his own knowledge of these places. For example, he urged them to "examine carefully" where they first met with the olive tree in going from Vienna to Trieste, and to report their findings to him, explaining that this "is a very interesting enquiry for S. Carolina & Georgia particularly. I have now orders from S. Carolina to send a large quantity of olive trees there, as they propose to endeavor to introduce the culture of that precious tree."

Jefferson's enthusiasm for the improvement and diversification of southern crops was shared by the leading South Carolinians of the day—the Rutledges, Draytons, Izards, and Pinckneys—who respected the opinions and suggestions of the versatile Virginian to the point of putting the latter into practice. "We received forty olive plants in good order from Mr. Jefferson," wrote Charles C. Pinckney in 1792, "& four caper plants, but three of them (the caper plants) were dead, the surviving one is in my garden & I shall take great care of it—at the meeting of the Society I shall propose to place Funds in Mr. Jefferson's hands for a regular supply of olive Trees & caper plants. . . . There were also some Pomegranate plants but I doubt whether they will be finer than our own."¹¹

¹⁰ Jefferson to John Rutledge, August 6, 1787, *ibid.*, VI, 250-52.

¹¹ Charles C. Pinckney to Thomas Pinckney, July 1, 1792, in Pinckney Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

Although the emphasis in the guide is on practical details, it will be noted that for every herd of Angora goats, for every orchard, for every vineyard mentioned, there is a cabinet of paintings, a work of scholarship, a fine garden recommended to the travelers. If Jefferson says little about the ruins of antiquity it is because he knows his audience. On the evidence of the journals kept by the young men during their tour, it would seem that there was no need to stimulate their interests in this latter direction. Shippen, the livelier and more sensitive of the two, devoted hours enumerating and describing in detail the wonderful artistic achievements of the ancient world which he saw.¹² Even Rutledge, whose heart was obviously not in his diary, gave considerable attention to the remains of the classical period, especially after he reached that part of Italy not covered by Jefferson's notes.¹³ Jefferson, no doubt, also had the travelers in mind when he disposed of European courts briefly and contemptuously. He had observed the susceptibility of Americans to the artificial brilliance of court society, and possibly had heard young Rutledge, who admired Marie Antoinette's fading beauty, indignantly defend the character of the Queen against the calumnious stories about her then current.¹⁴ In Jefferson's mind there was no question about her guilt: "The Queen cries, but sins on."¹⁵

Besides being a guide to objects of practical and cultural interest, the itinerary contained useful information about taverns, means of conveyance, excursions, and scenic routes. In writing it Jefferson relied on the detailed memoranda of his travels in France and Italy in 1787, and through the Netherlands and Germanies in the spring of the following year.¹⁶ Indeed, he frequently lifted whole phrases from his own notes. But these repetitions become emphases when it is recalled that they represent a process of selection.

One observation in the guide is of particular interest, as it bears directly on the "Philistine" controversy. Professor Chinard finds it re-

¹² Diary and Journal of Thomas Lee Shippen, 1788, in Shippen Papers.

¹³ Diary of John Rutledge, Jr., in Rutledge Papers (Duke University Library).

¹⁴ Journal covering a visit to France and England, 1787-1788, in Rutledge Papers.

¹⁵ Jefferson to John Adams, August 30, 1787, in Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, VI, 285-89.

¹⁶ Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, XVII, 153-236, 244-90.

markable that at Milan, Jefferson did not mention the cathedral.¹⁷ Obviously, only a "Philistine" would manifest such complete indifference to an imposing architectural monument. An examination of the guide, however, will show that Jefferson did comment on the cathedral, but, alas, only to say that it was "to be placed among the rarest instances of the misuse of money." On the other hand, Jefferson proposed to the travelers an excursion to Pavia to see the "Chartreux, the richest thing I ever saw." The fact that Jefferson does recommend this excursion, though he fails to refer to the "Chartreux" in his memoranda, would indicate that the memoranda do not completely reflect his interests, but evidence, rather, a conscientious effort to supplement his memory of certain matters, chiefly practical, by recording the pertinent details. For example, he was sufficiently impressed by the famous echo of Simonetta¹⁸ as to think it unnecessary to make any reference to it in the memoranda, but he advised the travelers to examine this interesting phenomenon.

Examined in its entirety, the "most damning document" for the prosecution would hardly convict Jefferson of philistinism. To be sure, he does give shrewd advice to the young men, and he does call their attention to the utilitarian and the prosaic, but that was his purpose in preparing the notes. Moreover, no "Philistine" would write in a hurriedly-composed travel guide: "fall down & worship the site of the Chateau di Saorgio, you never saw, nor will see such another."

Rutledge and Shippen did not entirely follow the route suggested by Jefferson, for they did not descend the Danube to Vienna but went, instead, from Strasbourg to Basel, and reached Italy by way of Mt. Cenis. At one time Jefferson had proposed that they go from Vienna to Constantinople, but the outbreak of hostilities between Sweden and Russia made him apprehensive of a general European conflict and he advised the young men not to risk such a hazardous journey.¹⁹ The travelers

¹⁷ Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson*, 168.

¹⁸ "Esempio notevole di eco multipla si ha nella villa Simonetta presso Milano, nel cui cortile un colpo d'arma de fuoco puo essere udito anche trenta volte." *Enciclopedia Italiana di Scienze, Lettere, ed Arti*, 36 vols. (Rome, 1929-1939), XIII, 423.

¹⁹ Jefferson to Rutledge, August 12, 1788, in Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, VII, 127-28.

had already abandoned the project on the advice of the Venezuelan revolutionist, Colonel Francisco Miranda, who convinced them that it was "quite impossible to visit Constantinople at this time—and that travelling, through the Ottoman territories, is not only unsafe but absolutely dangerous."²⁰ During that part of the journey which took them through the Holy Roman Empire, the Americans, at the suggestion of Marquis de Lafayette, passed themselves off as "militaires" by adding "fierce cockades" to their hats, and thereby succeeded in convincing the authorities that they were "Major" Shippen and "Captain" Rutledge.²¹

In most respects, the made-to-order itinerary received the attention to which it was entitled. Indeed, it is remarkable how closely the young men followed their great friend's line of thought and suggestions. To refer once more to the Cathedral of Milan, Shippen wrote concerning this church: "We went first to the Cathedral—an immense fabric which has employed the constant labour of the Nation 400 years, and remains now very far from being finished."²² Could he have been thinking of Jefferson's comment when he wrote this? Generally they stopped at the taverns recommended by "our good friend, Mr. Jefferson." On arriving at a town they dutifully walked around the ramparts. They were careful to note the agriculture and industry of the country through which they passed and occasionally they made crude sketches of mechanical contrivances, as Jefferson had proposed they do. Invariably they were delighted with the excursions and modes of travel suggested by "Mr. J." But being young and spirited, the travelers did not give their entire attention to inanimate objects. During his stay at Milan, Rutledge quite captivated the heart of that city's social leader, the Countess de Litta,²³ while earlier in the journey, Shippen found the keenest pleasure in the charming company of Madame de la Borde. His parting with the lady is thus tenderly described: "—she bad me write to her, I promised to obey—we were obliged to

²⁰ Rutledge to Jefferson, August [?], 1788, in Jefferson Papers, XLII (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

²¹ Shippen Diary.

²² Shippen Journal.

²³ De Litta correspondence, Rutledge Papers.

take leave—she had a bundle of flowers loose in her hands, I had them tyed up for her with great care, & this was the last act of kindness which I had it in my power to shew her.”²⁴ The young men parted company at Milan just when the social season was at its height—Shippen to return to the fogs of London for the November session of the courts; Rutledge to continue his Italian and French journey in the pleasant and stimulating company of William Short, Jefferson’s private secretary.²⁵

The recipients and the sender of the itinerary preserved their respective copies of it, with the result that there are now three such manuscripts—one among the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress,²⁶ another in the Shippen Papers, also in the Library of Congress, and a third among the Rutledge Papers at Duke University. Of the three copies, the one in the Shippen Papers is the clearest. This and the Rutledge copy contain a few sentences not included in the one which Jefferson preserved. For the sake of completeness and continuity, it has been thought best to include that part of the itinerary which has already been printed.

Old Louis or Dutch ducats are the best money to take with you.

Amsterdam to Utrecht: go in the Tracksout on account of the remarkable pleasantness of the canal. You can have the principal cabin to yourselves for 52 stivers. At Amsterdam I lodged at the Wapping van Amsterdam. I liked the Valet de place they furnished me. he spoke French, and was sensible & well informed. his name was Guillaume or William.

Utrecht. the best tavern Aubelette’s.—a steeple remarkable for its height.

Nimeguen.—Chez un Anglois à la place Royale—the Bellevue here is well worth seeing—the chateau also. at this place you must bribe your horse-hirer to put as few horses to your carriage as you think you can travel with. Because with whatever number of horses you arrive at the first post house in Germany, with that they will oblige you to go on through the whole empire. I paid the price of four horses on condition they would put but three to my chariot—on entering the Prussian dominion mark the effect of despotism on the people.

²⁴ Shippen Diary.

²⁵ Shepperson, *John Paradise and Lucy Ludwell*, 335-36.

²⁶ Jefferson Papers, XXXVI, pp. 6221-29.

Cleves.—The posthouse.—the road most used is by Xanten & Hochstrass—but that by Wesel & Duysberg is perhaps as short. near Duysberg is the place where Varus & his legions were cut off by the Germans. I could find no body in the village however, who could speak any language I spoke, & could not make them understand what I wished to see. I missed my object therefore, tho' I had taken this road on purpose—the Post house is the best tavern.

Dusseldorff.—Zweig brudder Hoff—chez Zimmerman—the best tavern I saw in my whole journey. in the palace is a collection of paintings equal in merit to anything in the world—that of Dresden is said to be as good—this will be worth repeated examination.—on the road from Dusseldorff to Cologne is a chateau of the Elector, worth seeing. there is a famous one at Bensberg, which is off the road. I do not know whether it is best to go to it from Dusseldorff or Cologne. being now in Westphalia take notice of the ham, and the hog of which it is made, as well as the process, price &c.

Cologne.—at the Holy ghost. chez Ingel. a good tavern.—this place & its commerce is to be noted. a good deal is carried on to America. it's quai resembles for the number of vessels, a sea-port town. from hence the Cologne mill stones are sent. but I could not satisfy myself where were the quarries; some say near Andernach, others at Triers on the Moselle.

Here begins the cultivation of the vine: & here too begins the walnut tree in open fields.

Bonne.—the court of England—the Palace here is to be seen.

Andernach—a large collection of the Cologne mill stones—enquire here from whence they are brought, & the price.

Coblentz. The Wildman or l'Homme sauvage. a very good tavern—the tavern-keeper furnished me with the *carte des postes d'Allemagne*. I paid his bill without examining it. when I looked into it, after my departure I found he had forgot to insert the [cost of the] map, & I had no sure opportunity of sending him the price—pray pay him for me with this apology, & I shall reimburse it with thankfulness. he is very obliging—he accompanied me to a gentleman well acquainted with the vineyards & wines of the Moselle about which I wished to inform myself. he will recollect me from that circumstance.²⁷

here call for Moselle wine and particularly that of Brownberg and of the grand Chanbellan's crop of 1783 that you may be acquainted with the best quality of Moselle wine—The Electors palace here is worth visiting & note the manner in which the rooms are warmed by tubes coming from an oven below. the Chateau over the river is to be visited. remarkably fine bread here, particularly the rolls for breakfast, from which the Philadelphians derive what

²⁷ "At Coblenz I paid the Landlord for your map—he had entirely forgot it—and says you are the best man in the world for remembering it." Rutledge to Jefferson, August 1, 1788, in Jefferson Papers, XLI.

they call the French roll, which does not exist in France, but has been carried over by the Germans.

From Coblenz to Mayence or Frankfort, the post road goes by Nassau, Nastaden, Schwalbach & Wisbaden. it is as mountainous as the passage of the Alps, & entirely a barren desert. were I to pass again, I would hire horses to carry me along the Rhine as far as a practicable road is to be found, then I would embark my carriage on a boat to be drawn by a horse or horses till you pass the cliffs which intercept the land communication.²⁸ this would be only for a few miles, say half a dozen or a dozen. you will see what I am told are the most picturesque scenes in the world, & which travellers go express to see, & you may be landed at the first village on the North East side of the river after passing the cliffs, & from thence hire horses to Mayence.—stop on the road at the village of Rudesheim, & the Abbaye of Johansberg to examine their vineyards & wines. the latter is the best made on the Rhine without comparison, & is about double the price of the oldest Hoch. that of the year 1775 is the best. I think they charge two florins & a half a bottle for it in the taverns.

Mayence. Hotel de Mayence—good & reasonable—the ham of Mayence is next to that of Westphalia for celebrity.

Hocheim is a little village on the road to Frankfort. stop there half an hour to see it's vineyards.

Frankfort—the Rothen house, or Red house²⁹—Chez M. Dick. the son of the Tavernkeeper speaks English & French, has resided some time in London, is sensible & obliging. I recommend here also my Valet de place, Arnaud. he is sensible, active, & obliging. he accompanied me to Hocheim, Mayence, Johansberg, & Rudesheim.—Messrs. Dick pere & fils, are great wine merchants. their cellar is worth seeing. you may taste at their tavern genuine Hoch & of the oldest.

Frankfort is a considerable place & worth examining in detail. Major de Geismer may happen to be here. if he be, present yourselves to him in my name. if you shew him this note, it will serve to insure you all the attentions you need. he can tell what there is worth seeing. if he is not here you will find him at Hainau where he is now in garrison [?] & to which place you should make an excursion. I shall write to him soon & will prepare him for your visit:³⁰—near the village of Bergen, which may be seen from the road to Hanau, was fought the battle of Bergen between Marshal Broglio & Prince

²⁸ This suggestion was followed, to the great pleasure of the travelers.

²⁹ “. . . the most spacious and magnificent tavern in Europe.” Shippen Diary.

³⁰ When Major Geismer, or Baron Geismer, was a convention prisoner during the American Revolution, Jefferson applied in his behalf for an exchange or a parole in order to enable the Baron to return to Germany for the settlement of his estates. Jefferson had been willing to vouch for the Baron's personal merit. Jefferson to Richard Henry

Ferdinand in 1759. a quarter of a mile from Hanau is Williamsbath, a seat of the Landgrave of the Hesse, well worth visiting.

Manheim—cour du Palatin. good tavern. at this place you must propose to make some stay. buy the pamphlet which mentions the curiosities of the town & country. the gallery of paintings is more considerable than that of Dusseldorf, but has not so many precious things. the observatory worth seeing.—excursion to Kaeferthall to see the plantation of Rhubarb, & herd of wild boars.—excursion to Dossenheim to see the Angora goats. they are in the mountains a few leagues beyond Dossenheim.—excursion to Heidelberg.³¹ the chateau is the most imposing ruin of modern ages. its situation is the most romantic and the most delightful possible. I should have been glad to have passed days at it. the situation is on a great scale, what that of Vauclose is on a small one.—excursion to Schwetzingen to see the gardens.—they are not to be compared to the English gardens, but they are among the best of Germany.

Note. Kaefarthall, Dossenheim, Heidelberg, & Schwetzingen may be visited in a circle if more convenient. remark the boat bridges & manner of their opening to let vessel pass.

Carlsruhe. this place is not noted in the post map, but it is a post station, & well worth staying at a day or two. the posts leading to it are Spire & Craben. Carlsruhe is the seat of the Margrave of Baden, an excellent sovereign if we may judge of him from the appearance of his dominions. the town seems to be only an appendage to his palace.—the tavern is au Prince hereditaire, good & reasonable. visit the palace & particularly its tower. visit the gardens minutely—you will see in them deer of an uncommon kind, Angora goats, tamed beavers, & a fine collection of pheasants.

Strasburgh. à l'Esprit.—The Cardinal de Rohan's palace is to be seen—the steeple of the cathedral, which I believe is the highest in the world, and the handsomest. go to the very top of it; but let it be the last operation of the day, as you will need a long rest after it.³² Koenig, bookseller here, has the best shop of classical books I ever saw.³³—Baskerville's types I think are in this town. Beaumarchais' editions of Voltaire are printing here.—here you will

Lee, April 21, 1779, in Bergh (ed.), *Writings*, IV, 291-92. Rutledge and Shippen could not say enough about the courtesies extended to them by the Baron. "He said much of the friendship which you shewed him whilst he was a Prisoner in Virginia and seem'd happy in having an Opportunity of being kind to one of your friends." Rutledge to Jefferson, August 1, 1788, in *Jefferson Papers*, XLI.

³¹ Rutledge took note of the university at this place: "It is, I believe, where education may be recd. cheaper than any where else—a Student here is attended by all the diff. masters of Languages &c.—is lodged—fed—cloathed & taken care of for fifty pounds a year. for 60 he may live handsomely." Rutledge Diary.

³² Of course they went to the top of it.

³³ Jefferson was a customer of Koenig.

take a different route from mine.—The rivers Rhine & Danube will be the best guides in general. you will probably visit the falls of Schaffhausen, and make an excursion to Geneva. at Ulm if you find it eligible, you can embark on the Danube & descend it to Vienna. From Vienna to Trieste. examine carefully where you first meet with the olive tree & be so good as to inform me of it. this is a very interesting enquiry for S. Carolina & Georgia particularly. I have now orders from S. Carolina to send a large quantity of olive trees there, as they propose to endeavor to introduce the culture of that precious tree.

General observations. buy Dutems buy beforehand the map of the country you are going into. on arriving at a town the first thing is to buy the plan of the town & the book noting its curiosities. walk around the ramparts when there are any & go to the top of a steeple to have a view of the town & its environs.

When you are doubting whether a thing is worth the trouble of going to see, recollect that you will never again be so near it, that you may repent the not having seen it, but can never repent having seen it. but there is an opposite extreme too, that is, the seeing too much. a judicious selection is to be aimed at, taking care that the indolence of the moment have no influence on the decision. take care particularly not to let the porters of churches, cabinets, &c. lead you through all the little details in their possession, which will load the memory with trifles, fatigue the attention & waste that & your time. it is difficult to confine these people to the few objects worth seeing and remembering. they wish for your money, & suppose you give it more willingly, the more they detail to you.

When one calls in the taverns for the *vin du pays* they give what is natural, unadulterated & cheap: when *vin etrangere* is called for, it only gives a pretext for charging an extravagant price for an unwholesome stuff, very often of their own brewing.

the people you will naturally see the most of will be tavernkeepers, valets de place, & postillions. These are the hackneyed rascals of every country. of course they must never be considered when we calculate the national character.

Before entering Italy buy Addison's travels. he visited that country as a classical amateur, & it gives infinite pleasure to apply one's classical reading on the spot. Besides it aids our future recollection of the place. buy the *Guide pour le voyage d'Italie en poste*, the latest edition, it is the postbook of Italy—the theatres, public walks, & public markets to be frequented. at these you see the inhabitants from high to low.

Objects of Attention for an American

1. Agriculture. every thing belonging to this art, & whatever has a near relation to it. useful or agreeable animals which might be transported to America; rare species of plants for the farm or garden, according to the climate of the different states.
2. Mechanical arts, so far as they respect things necessary in America, and inconvenient to be transported thither ready made. such are forges, stone-quarries, boats, bridges (very specially) &c. &c.
3. lighter mechanical arts & manufactures. some of these will be worth a superficial view, but circumstances rendering it impossible that America should become a manufacturing country during the time of any man now living, it would be a waste of attention to examine these minutely.
4. Gardens. peculiarly worth the attention of an American, because it is the country of all others where the noblest gardens may be made without expense. we have only to cut out the superabundant plants.
5. Architecture.—worth great attention. as we double our numbers every 20 years we must double our houses. besides we build of such perishable materials that one half of our houses must be rebuilt in every space of 20 years. so that in that term, houses are to be built for three fourths of our inhabitants. it is then among the most important arts. & it is desirable to introduce taste into an art which shews so much.
6. Painting, statuary.—too expensive for the state of wealth among us. it would be useless therefore & preposterous for us to endeavor to make ourselves connoisseurs in those arts. they are worth seeing, but not studying.
7. Politics of each country. well worth studying so far as respects internal affairs. examine their influence on the happiness of the people: take every possible occasion of entering into the hovels of the labourers, & especially at the moments of their repast, see what they eat, how they are cloathed, whether they are obliged to labour too hard; whether the government or their landlord takes from them an unjust proportion of their labour; on what footing stands the property they call their own, their personal liberty &c.
8. Courts.—to be seen as you wd. see the Tower of London or menagerie of Versailles with their Lions, tygers, hyaenas & other beasts of prey, standing in the same relation to their fellows: a slight acquaintance with them will suffice to show you that, under the most imposing exterior, they are the weakest & worst part of mankind. their manners could you ape them, would not make you beloved in your own country, nor would they improve it, could you introduce them there to the exclusion of that honest simplicity now prevailing in America, & worthy of being cherished.

At Venice Mr. Shippen will of course call on his relation the Countess Barziza.⁸⁴ here the question must be determined whether you will go down the coast of the Adriatic & come up that of the Mediterranean; or go by Padua & Bologna to Florence & so down the coast of the Mediterranean & back again the same road to Florence.

on your return from Florence, the route will be

Pistoia

Lucca

Pisa

Leghorn

Pisa

Lerici

La Spetia

Sesti

Porto Fino

Nervi.—here you re-enter my tour.

the gardens of the Count Durazzo at this place are extremely well worth seeing. they exhibit a very rare mixture of the utile dulci, & are therefore to be peculiarly attended to by an American. Woburn farm in England is the only thing I ever saw superior, in this point, to Count Durazzo's gardens at Nervi.—between Nervi & Genoa is a palace worth stopping to see. there is good architecture & a fine prospect. I forgot to whom it belongs. I am not certain that the road from Porto Fino to Genoa leads by Nervi. if it does not, it will be an excursion of only 4. or 5. hours from Genoa.

Genoa. Ste. Marthe is the tavern here, most in the English stile. but le Cerf (more in the French stile) is much the most agreeably situated: the back windows look into the port & sea—abundance to be seen here. The Description des beautés de Genoa & ses environs, will give you all the details, but prefer a good selection to seeing the whole. an excursion to Sestri, Pegli &c. see the description des beautés de Genoa.—The Prince Lamellino's gardens at Sestri are the finest I ever saw out of England. do not be persuaded to go by water from Genoa to Nice—you will lose a great deal of pleasure which the journey by land will afford you. take mules therefore at Genoa. horses are not to be trusted on the precipices you will have to pass. I paid a livre of Piedmont per mile for three mules & this included the drivers wages but not his etrennes. a livre of Piedmont is a shilling sterling. so it is 4. pence a mile for every mule. from Genoa to Nice is 125. miles, geometrical: viz. to Savona 30 miles. to Albenga 30. Oneglia 20. Ventimiglia 25. Monaco 10. Nice 10.

⁸⁴Formerly Miss Lucy Paradise, eldest daughter of Lucy (Ludwell) and John Paradise. For a delightful account of her elopement with Count Barziza, see Shepperson, *John Paradise and Lucy Ludwell*, 245-73.

Noli. here you see the aloe on a precipice hanging over the sea. a fishing village of 1200 inhabitants. a miserable tavern, but they can give you good fish, viz. Sardines, fresh anchovies &c. & probably strawberries; perhaps too ortolans. they gave me all these on the 28th. of April.

Albenga.—the most detestable gite called a tavern, that I ever saw in any part of the earth & the dearest too. a very fine extensive plain here worth visiting.

Oneglia } considerable towns, a mile apart, worth giving a day to. your
Port Maurice { mules will be better for the rest & yourselves also. but you must have provided for this in your bargain at Genoa. or take mules at Genoa only to Oneglia & there take fresh ones.

St. Remo—the Auberge de la Poste a very good one. the rooms look into a handsome garden, & there are Palm trees under the windows. a half a day might be well given to this place.

Ventimiglia

Bordighera—very extensive plantations of Palm trees in the neighborhood of this place.

Menton—fine orange plantations.

Monaco—it is a little off the road, but worth going to see.

Nice.—I lodged at the Hotel de York. it is a fine English tavern very agreeably situated & the mistress a friendly agreeable woman. there is another English hotel of equal reputation—the wine of Nice is remarkably good—you may pass many days here very agreeably. it is in fact an English colony.—call here on Monsr. Sasserno a merchant of this place & very good man. be so kind as to present him my compliments & assure him that I retain a due sense of his friendly attentions. I was recommended to him by the Abbé Arnaud. I am persuaded he will give you any local information you may have occasion for.

Were you to go directly from this place to Marseilles you would see only what is least worth your seeing: while you would miss precious objects which require a circle to be made from hence. I propose the following circuit therefore to terminate at Marseilles.—Cross the Alps at Col de Tende. hire mules & a carriage at Nice to take you to Limone, which is three days journey. you will probably be obliged to leave your carriage the 2d. or 3d. day; but your mules in their return, will carry it back to Nice. There are many curious & enchanting objects on this passage. watch where you lose and where you recover the Olive tree in rising and descending the several successive mountains. fall down & worship the site of the Chateau di Saorgio, you never saw, nor will see such another. this road is probably the greatest work of this kind which ever was executed either in ancient or modern times. it did not cost as much as one year's war. Descending the Alps on the other side you will have a view of the plains of the Po, & of Lombardy in general which en-

couraged the army of Hannibal to surmount the difficulties of their passage. where they passed is not known at this day: tho' some authors pretend to trace it.—Speckled trout on all the road from Nice to Turin.

Turin. hotel d'Angleterre. much to be seen here. excursions to Moncaglieri, Stupanigi, Superga:³⁵ ask for Nebiule wine. Montferrat wines worth tasting. cabinet of antiquities here worth seeing.

Excursion to Milan.—Vercelli—hotel des trois Rois. wines of Gatina & Salusola—here is made the best of the Piedmont rice. Mr. Rutledge should examine the husking mills, manner of cleaning, culture, produce, price, & manners of using it.

Novara—fields of rice all along the road.

Milan—Albergo reale the best inn:—buy the nuova guida de Milano, which will give you the details of what are to be seen. add to them the casa Candi-ani which I think is built since the publication of the book. Excursion to Rozzano to see Parmesan cheese made, & the management of their dairies.³⁶ see their ice-houses. learn the method of storing snow instead of ice. ask for Mascaroni, a rich & excellent kind of curd, and enquire how it is made.—go on from Rozzano to the celebrated church of the Chartreux, the richest thing I ever saw.—excursion to hear the echo of Simonetta.

the cathedral of Milan a worthy object of philosophical contemplation, to be placed among the rarest instances of the misuse of money. on viewing the churches of Italy it is evident without calculation that the same expense would have sufficed to throw the Appenines into the Adriatic & thereby render it terra firma from Leghorn to Constantinople.

fine excursion to the Lago di Como &c.—return to Turin.

From Turin cross the Alps at Mount Cenis, & go to Geneva & Lyons. not having travelled this road I can say nothing of it.

Lyons—the best tavern is on the place de Bellecour. a good deal to be seen here. do not be persuaded to go down by water; it is dangerous & you lose the view of the country.

Vienne—à la Poste. the tavern keeper capable of giving you some account of the antiquities here—the Praetorian palace worth seeing. now used as a church and schoolroom. the sepulchral pyramid a little way out of the town is handsome. a league below Vienne, on the opposite side of the river is the Cote-rotie.

Tains. do not go to the tavern at the Post house, the master of which is a most unconscionable rascal. there is another tavern before you get to that which has a better mien.—on the hill impending over this village is made the wine

³⁵ "From Moncaglieri I directed my course to Stupaniggi—these were the three objects to which Mr. Jefferson turned my attention." Shippen Journal. The trip was made in a heavy rain which flooded the roads.

³⁶ Rutledge took detailed notes on the preparation of Parmesan cheese. Rutledge Diary.

called Hermitage, so justly celebrated. go up to the hermitage on the top of the hill, for the sake of the sublime prospect from thence. be so good, as for me, to ask the names of the persons whose vineyards produce the Hermitage of the very first quality, how much each makes, at what price it is sold new, & also at what price when fit for use. be particular as to the white wine, & so obliging as to write me the result.

Montelimart—the country here is delicious.

Pont St. Esprit, to be seen.

Orange. a little before this you see the first olive trees. some antiquities here.

Avignon.—the post house a good tavern charmingly situated—it is called the Hotel du Palais Royal, & is on the place de la porte Pio. the hotel de St. Omer, more frequented, is disagreeably situated.

taste the vin blanc di M. de Rochegude, resembling Madeira somewhat.

a charming excursion to Vaucluse about 20 miles of Avignon. it is worth climbing up to the Chateau which they pretend to be Petrarch's. the tomb of Laura is to be seen in a church of Avignon.

Aix. the hotel St. Jaques a very good one. the bread at this place is equal to any in the world; the oil is also considered as the best.

I had here an excellent valet de place named Flamand.

A neat town but little to be seen. leave here the cultivation of the olive.

Marseilles—Hotel des Princes. well situated & tolerably good—the Hotel de Bourbon & de York at the end of the course is in rather higher reputation. The commerce of this place is the most remarkable circumstance. visit the Chateau on a hill commanding the town called Notre Dame de la garde. M. Bergasse's wine cellar. excursion to the chateau Borelli. excursion by water to the Chateau d'If.

excursion to Toulon—examine the cultivation of the caper at Cuges & Toulon: go on to Hieres, which on account of its orange groves is worth seeing.

from Hieres there is a chateau de Geans worth going to see. it belongs to the Marquis de Pontoives:

at Marseilles enquire into the cultivation & species of the dried raisin which could not fail to succeed in S. Carolina. enquire also into the species of figs. buy here a plan of the canal of Languedoc in 3 sheets.

St. Remis. the tavern keeper here is an intelligent man. some fine ruins about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from this place.

Arles—a fine amphitheatre, & an abundance of antient sarcophages, in the champs elysées. detestable tavern.

Pont de gard—on the road. one of the most superb remains of antiquity.
 Nismes. the name of the hotel I lodged at the first time I was there was, I think, le petit Louvre, a very good inn—the 2d. time I lodged at the Luxembourg, not so good.—The vin ordinaire here is excellent and costs but 2 or 3 sous a bottle. this is the cheapest place in France to buy silk stockings. the amphitheatre here and the maison quarrée are two of the most superb remains of antiquity which exist. they deserve to be very much studied.

the fountain of Nismes is also very curious.

there is a book of the curiosities of the place

the cabinet de Segur well worth seeing.

Lunel. remarkable for its fine muscat wines. it is only a village.

Montpellier. this place is soon seen.

Frontignan. a village remarkable for it's fine muscat wine. M. Lambert Medecin, will give you any information you desire on your calling on him *de ma part*. he is a very sensible man.

Cette—a place of growing commerce. remarkable as the principal sea-port for the canal of Languedoc. here you may embark to pass through the Etang de Tau.

Agde—here you may either go on the post boats which pass from hence to Thoulouse in 4 days, or you may hire a small boat & horse & go at your leisure, examining everything as you go. I paid 12 livres a day for a boat, a horse & driver. I was 9. days going, because I chose to go leisurely.

Beziers—a wine country. it is here in fact that they make most of the wine exported under the name Frontignan.

Carcassonne. near this place (viz. at la Lande) you see the last olive trees.

Castelnaudari. it takes a day to go & visit the sources of water which supply the canal of Languedoc, viz. St. Feriol, Escamaze, Lampy.—here you hire horses & a guide. it gives a day's rest too to your boat horse. Observe that after you leave Cette you can get no butter for your breakfast through the whole canal, & rarely eatable bread. a stock of butter & biscuit should be laid in at Cette.

Toulouse. here ends the canal. from hence you may go down the Garonne by water, or go post. you pass near Langon & Sauterne, remarkable for their fine wines.

Bordeaux—the best tavern is the hotel D'Angleterre chez Stevens & Jacob. a place of great commerce. there are some remains here of an antient circus of brick. you will before have had occasion to remark the size and texture of the antient brick. the different kinds of their wine to be enquired into,

the owners of the best vineyards, prices of the wines of all qualities &c. brandies. remark the elm-trees in the Quai des Chartrons. from Bordeaux to Blaye you may go by water.

Rochefort—the tavern is le Bacha.

Rochelle—

Nantes—I suppose the new tavern by the theater is now ready. if not, you will be puzzled for lodging.

if you chuse to see L'Orient it should be by way of excursion, returning to Nantes & taking the road up the Loire.

observe the subterraneous houses in the banks.

Tours. the tavern is le Faison. this place worth seeing. an excursion to the Chateau of M. de la Sauvagere, at Grillemont 6. leagues from Tours on the road to Bordeaux, now belonging to M. D'Orcai, to verify the fact of the spontaneous growth of shells related by Voltaire in his Questions Encyclopediques art. Coquilles, & by M. de la Sauvagere in his Recueil de dissertations. this last is the important source of enquiry, & probably you may find the book at Tours, tho' it is very rare.

Chanteloup—well worth seeing & examining.

Blois—Orleans—Paris.

LETTERS FROM A SOUTHERN OPPONENT OF SECTIONALISM,

SEPTEMBER, 1860, TO JUNE, 1861

EDITED BY ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR.

As the crisis of secession and war unfolded in the autumn and winter of 1860-1861, two brothers—one in the South and the other in the North—continued to correspond as long as postal communications were kept open. Only the letters written from the South have been preserved, but they are printed in full below. In them is clearly developed the point of view of a plantation owner in Mississippi who hated sectionalism but nevertheless followed his state when the break came.¹ Through incidental references, the attitude of his brother is also re-

¹ For an expression by a fellow Mississippian of the same point of view—essentially that of the old Whigs—see Percy L. Rainwater (ed.), "The Autobiography of Benjamin Grubb Humphries, August 26, 1808-December 20, 1882," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XXI (1934), 231-55, especially 243-45.

the owners of the best vineyards, prices of the wines of all qualities &c. brandies. remark the elm-trees in the Quai des Chartrons. from Bordeaux to Blaye you may go by water.

Rochefort—the tavern is le Bacha.

Rochelle—

Nantes—I suppose the new tavern by the theater is now ready. if not, you will be puzzled for lodging.

if you chuse to see L'Orient it should be by way of excursion, returning to Nantes & taking the road up the Loire.

observe the subterraneous houses in the banks.

Tours. the tavern is le Faison. this place worth seeing. an excursion to the Chateau of M. de la Sauvagere, at Grillemont 6. leagues from Tours on the road to Bordeaux, now belonging to M. D'Orcai, to verify the fact of the spontaneous growth of shells related by Voltaire in his Questions Encyclopediques art. Coquilles, & by M. de la Sauvagere in his Recueil de dissertations. this last is the important source of enquiry, & probably you may find the book at Tours, tho' it is very rare.

Chanteloup—well worth seeing & examining.

Blois—Orleans—Paris.

LETTERS FROM A SOUTHERN OPPONENT OF SECTIONALISM,

SEPTEMBER, 1860, TO JUNE, 1861

EDITED BY ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR.

As the crisis of secession and war unfolded in the autumn and winter of 1860-1861, two brothers—one in the South and the other in the North—continued to correspond as long as postal communications were kept open. Only the letters written from the South have been preserved, but they are printed in full below. In them is clearly developed the point of view of a plantation owner in Mississippi who hated sectionalism but nevertheless followed his state when the break came.¹ Through incidental references, the attitude of his brother is also re-

¹ For an expression by a fellow Mississippian of the same point of view—essentially that of the old Whigs—see Percy L. Rainwater (ed.), "The Autobiography of Benjamin Grubb Humphries, August 26, 1808-December 20, 1882," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XXI (1934), 231-55, especially 243-45.

vealed—the attitude of a small farmer in an Illinois township that “was reputed a ‘hot bed of abolitionists.’”² Intensifying the personal drama of the letters were three poignant facts: that the father of these two brothers had fought in the Revolution,³ that the two men eventually furnished sons to the opposing armies in the Civil War, and that the southern father lost two of his three sons in battle.

The writer of these letters, Daniel Perrin Bestor, was born in Suffield, Connecticut, on February 2, 1797.⁴ As a youth he went to Lexington, Kentucky, to study law, presumably at Transylvania University. At the age of twenty-two, however, he became a minister of the Baptist Church, and moved to Alabama, thereafter identifying himself completely with the lower South. For fourteen years he filled pastorates in the northern part of the state, serving as did many of his colleagues without remuneration while supporting himself by farming. In 1833 he moved to Greensboro and established a female school. Its reputation was such that he was made a trustee of the University of Alabama (1836-1843) and was elected to the state legislature. His efforts, dur-

² Newton Bateman and others (eds.), *Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois and History of Knox County* (Chicago, 1899), 813. In 1860 Knox County furnished Lincoln with a plurality of 1,624 over Douglas. *Tribune Almanac and Political Register* (New York, 1838-), 1861, p. 56.

³ The father was the elder Daniel Perrin Bestor, of Suffield, Connecticut. His military service is mentioned in the letter of September 13, 1860, below, and he is referred to as “a major in the Revolutionary War” in Thomas M. Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*, 4 vols. (Chicago, 1921), III, 139. On the other hand, the name does not appear in such compilations as Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution* (Revised ed., Washington, 1914), and Henry P. Johnston (ed.), *Record of Service of Connecticut Men in the . . . War of the Revolution* (Hartford, 1889), with the two complementary lists published in Connecticut Historical Society, *Collections* (Hartford, 1860-1932), VIII (1901) and XII (1909). Since the original records are admittedly incomplete, this lack of evidence is not sufficiently conclusive to justify a rejection of the son’s statement.

⁴ Biographical sketches are in Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 139; and William Garrett, *Reminiscences of Public Men in Alabama, for Thirty Years* (Atlanta, 1872), 60-61. Inscriptions on the Bestor family monuments in Magnolia Cemetery, Mobile, Alabama, have been copied for me by Mrs. Clarendon McClure of that city. Other sources are cited in footnotes below. Family information has been furnished by Miss Ruth E. Bestor, Redlands, California; Mrs. C. R. Bell, Anniston, Alabama; and Mrs. Minerva J. Davis, Agawam, Massachusetts. For checking official records and supplying information from certain printed sources, I am indebted to Mrs. Laura D. S. Harrell of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson, and Mr. H. N. Remington, Town Clerk of Suffield, Connecticut.

ing the session of 1837, were concerned mainly with improvement of the common schools.⁵ Subsequent pastorates took him to Gainesville and other places in western Alabama,⁶ and in 1856 he crossed the line into the state of Mississippi. It was from his plantation at Prairie Line, Jasper County, in that state, that the earlier letters in the following collection were dated, the others being written from Mobile, Alabama, where he spent considerable time during the years before 1861. The war apparently caused him to retire to his plantation, and to concentrate his attention upon affairs in Mississippi, in the legislature of which he served in 1863-1864.⁷ After the war, however, his connections with Mobile were resumed, and he died there on April 9, 1869. All three of his sons fought in the armies of the Confederacy, and two of them gave their lives in its cause. The eldest, John T. Bestor, fell at Malvern Hill on July 1, 1862, aged twenty-six. The youngest, Frank Eggleston Bestor, a lieutenant in Company B, Eighth Alabama Cavalry, C.S.A., was killed on April 12, 1865, at Calebee Creek, aged twenty-one.⁸ The third son, Daniel Perrin Bestor, Jr. (1840-1911), was a sergeant in Company D, Thirty-seventh Mississippi Infantry, C.S.A., fought through all four years of the war, returned to the practice of law in Mobile, and became mayor of that city.⁹ All three sons are mentioned in the correspondence that follows.

The letters of Daniel Perrin Bestor, Senior (1797-1869), that follow were written to his brother, Thomas Jefferson Bestor. The latter was

⁵ Garrett, *Reminiscences*, 60, 751, 792; Willis Brewer, *Alabama: Her History, Resources, War Record, and Public Men, from 1540 to 1872* (Montgomery, 1872), 270; University of Alabama, *Register of the Officers and Students, 1831-1901* (Tuscaloosa, 1901), 19. Daniel P. Bestor was also a trustee of Howard College, Marion, Alabama, 1841-1853. Owen, *History of Alabama*, I, 713.

⁶ David Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America* (New York, 1848), 755; Zachary T. Leavell and T. J. Bailey, *A Complete History of Mississippi Baptists, from the Earliest Times*, 2 vols. (Jackson, 1904), I, 183.

⁷ Dunbar Rowland (comp.), *Official and Statistical Register of the State of Mississippi* (Nashville, 1908), 67.

⁸ Inscriptions in Magnolia Cemetery, Mobile.

⁹ Mississippi Official Military Records of the Confederate States Army (Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson); biographical sketch of D. P. Bestor, Jr., in Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 139.

born in Suffield, Connecticut, probably a few years later than his brother, whom he outlived by a decade. In 1854 he left his native town, migrating to Illinois, where he settled first at Knoxville and then at Galva. Finally, in January, 1858, he moved to Altona, Knox County,¹⁰ where in 1860-1861 he was struggling with the financial difficulties alluded to in the following letters. He died in 1878 or 1879. His son, Orson Porter Bestor (1844-1922) enlisted in Company D, Sixty-ninth Illinois Infantry, on June 4, 1862. After the war he completed his studies and devoted a lifetime to the Baptist ministry, as had his southern uncle.¹¹ The letters printed here were preserved by him from his father's papers, and have been handed down in the family. The present writer, in whose possession they now are, is a great-grandson of the original recipient.

Daniel Perrin Bestor's plantation lay some eight miles west of the Mobile and Ohio Railway, the nearest station being at De Soto, Mississippi. The plans which he discusses for direct trade with his brother were dependent upon the completion of that railroad. As late as February 17, 1861, it had not been brought into operation as a through line. Trains were running on the southern division from Mobile, Alabama, through De Soto, to Corinth, Mississippi, a total of 328 miles, and on the northern division from Jackson, Tennessee, to Columbus, Kentucky, a distance of 77 miles,¹² leaving a 56-mile gap

¹⁰ Biographical information concerning Thomas J. Bestor is scanty. Places and dates given in this passage are taken from a small notebook in which his son, Orson P. Bestor, recorded information on his own life from 1844 to 1870 (MS. in my possession). Envelopes in which six of the following letters were sent have been preserved, all addressed to T. J. Bestor at Altona, Knox County, Illinois. On June 4, 1862, however, O. P. Bestor enlisted from Walnut Grove, McDonough County (Illinois, Adjutant General, *Report*, revised by J. N. Reece; Springfield, 1900-1902; IV, 476), which indicates that his father's effort to save the Altona farm had failed during the preceding twelve months.

¹¹ For biographical information on O. P. Bestor, see Brown University, Class of 1872, *Record, 1872-1887* (Boston, 1887); Brown University, *Historical Catalogue, 1764-1934* (Providence, 1936), 252; Newton Theological Institution, *General Catalogue, 1826-1912* (Institution Bulletin, Vol. IV, No. 3, April, 1912), 137; University of Chicago, *Alumni Directory, 1919* (Chicago, 1920), 31.

¹² *Appleton's Illustrated Railway and Steam Navigation Guide*, April, 1861, pp. 256, 261; *W. Alvin Lloyd's Southern Steamboat & Rail Road Guide*, February, 1861, p. 70.

from Corinth to Jackson, which was being rushed to completion.¹³ In the meantime connections to the Mississippi River could be made via the lines running from Meridian to Vicksburg¹⁴ and from Corinth to Memphis. D. P. Bestor relied upon the latter link,¹⁵ with water transportation on the Mississippi to Memphis. His knowledge of the geography of Illinois was vague, however, for he expected his brother to ship by rail to Cairo¹⁶—over lines that actually totalled 388 miles—whereas Altona lay on the main line of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, only 58 miles from the Mississippi at East Burlington.¹⁷

Plans for exchange of goods ceased with the outbreak of war, and even the exchange of ideas was interrupted. Threatened stoppage of the mails between North and South is mentioned in the concluding letter of this series, on June 27, 1861. Already the postmasters-general of both Union and Confederacy had ordered the cessation of postal service between them, effective May 31. Temporizing in this matter came to an end after the act of July 13, 1861, of the United States Congress, and the proclamations that ensued in August.¹⁸ No later correspondence between the two brothers is extant.

¹³ The hope had been to complete the link by January 1, 1861. *American Railroad Journal* (New York, 1832-1886), XXXII (1859), 660; *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XXVIII (1860), 591. The letter of May 10, 1861, below, strongly suggests that the through line had been opened by that date. In any case, it is shown as complete in the *Atlas to Accompany the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1891-1895), plates 25, 153, 154. Two often-quoted historical accounts date the completion of the line some years too early. See Edward Vernon (ed.), *American Railroad Manual* (New York, 1873), 351, and Balthasar H. Meyer, *History of Transportation in the United States before 1860* (Washington, 1917), 475.

¹⁴ As late as November 21, 1860, however, trains were running on the Southern Mississippi Railway from Vicksburg only as far east as Newton, 30 miles short of a junction with the Mobile and Ohio at Meridian. *Appleton's Illustrated Railway and Steam Navigation Guide*, April, 1861, p. 259. The letter of December 7, 1860, below, suggests that the connection had been made or was about to be made. By February, 1861, trains were running through to Meridian. *W. Alvin Lloyd's Southern Steamboat & Rail Road Guide*, February, 1861, p. 62.

¹⁵ *Appleton's Illustrated Railway and Steam Navigation Guide*, April, 1861, p. 256. See letter of January 28, 1861, below.

¹⁶ See letters of November 4 and December 7, 1860, below.

¹⁷ *Appleton's Illustrated Railway and Steam Navigation Guide*, April, 1861, pp. 190, 191.

¹⁸ John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States during Lincoln's Administration* (New York, 1927), 157-59; *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, May 20, 1861.

Prairie Line Jasper Co.
Miss. Sept. 13th 1860.¹⁹

My Dear Brother;

Letters from Bro. Hibbard, inform me that you are embarrassed, and must have some money this fall or loose your farm. Now Dorcas and I purpose, helping you, and we want to know what is the least you can get along with.

Now will you be sure to save it, if you pay for it. Dont pay unless you are sure. We have property but are hard up for money. Let us have a plain candid letter. Tell us what debts *must* be paid, and what can be put off,—and *when*.

This Country had *no rain* during the time of the growing crop. The corn is about half a crop. The cotton may fall off one million of bales, but the Country then will make enough,—too much I fear. This Country prospers rapidly in spite of this disaster. The cotton crop this year of the south, will sell for the enormous sum of one hundred and seventy five millions of dollars.

A good crop of corn for me would be three thousand bushels. I shall make about seventeen hundred. A good crop of cotton would be one hundred bales. I shall make perhaps sixty five. 'Tis now worth, clear money, about fifty dollars a bale.

I am in debt, and have more money to pay this Winter, than I shall make. I have picked out about twenty-five bales of cotton, and can pick out more than one bale a day. It always brings cash readily.

I live in a coarse log house, in order to get out of debt. I live well but plainly, and have about the house, some four good servants.

I hope you are not a political fanatic, engaged in destroying the noble union which our Father fought for. I am no sectionalist and never shall be. I have no respect for one either north or south. We should leave each section to take care of itself.

Yours truly
D. P. BESTOR

Mr. T. J. B.

My address is at the beginning of this letter. But Direct to Mobile as I am generally there.²⁰

Sunday.
Prairie Line, Jasper Co.
Mississippi Nov 4th 1860²¹

Dear Thomas;

Yours of a month since is at hand. About the twelveth of this month I shall send Hibbard two hundred dollars for you. This is according to your plan. Read Hibbard's letter of this date, and you will see the cause of delay.

¹⁹ Envelope postmarked De Soto, Mississippi, same date.

²⁰ This postscript is in the margin of the first page of the manuscript.

²¹ Envelope postmarked De Soto, Mississippi, November 6, 1860. Election day was

I regret your embarrassment, but you must be helped out of it, if possible. This two hundred dollars is not lent but given, by Dorcas and me.

This coming year the Rail-road to the mouth of the Ohio will be finished. Reports, on the road, say it will be finished in the Spring. Now my farm is near this Road. I suppose you are connected with the mouth of the Ohio. So soon as the road is finished I intend you shall send me pork, flour, and corn as an experiment.

If such produce will bear the cost of Agents, and percentage and profits, around by New Orleans, it seems to me that you and I can both make something by "direct trade". It is at least worth a trial. You probably know more about the connexion, at the Ohio than I do.

Could not Hibbard do something profitable at such a business.

Mrs. Townes, my mother in law, is dead. She died near Austin Texas, leaving my Children some three or four thousand dollars. I purpose going after the property about Christmas.

I hope to see you next Summer if we both live. The *road* will be done, and I can reach you in some two or three days. I now eat breakfast at home and supper at Mobile or, Breakfast at Mobile and a late dinner at home.

Here is my farm, but I spend my time in Mobile. Alway direct your letters to Mobile.

Yours truly

D. P. BESTOR

Clark Co. Miss. Dec. 7th. 1860.²²

Dear Brother;

Last night, John, my oldest Son, was married to Miss Eliza Barnett, commonly called Tide. She is a nice lady living in this neighbourhood. Perhaps it adds a little to the interest of the event, that Mr. Barnett is a nice old gentleman, and is quite rich. John Julia and I, start for Mobile in the morning.

I hope the draft I sent, will benefit you. You seem to think so in yours of Nov 25th. Keep me posted up, about your affairs. I feel much anxiety about you, and should be glad to help you more.

Sectionalism is bearing its legitimate fruits. Starving labourers, broken merchants, suspended banks, and the trumpet of civil war. Well did Franklin say, "Experience teaches a dear school, but fools will learn at no other."

November 6, and this letter indicates that D. P. Bestor voted in Jasper County, which gave 712 votes to John C. Breckinridge, 361 to John Bell, 18 to Stephen A. Douglas, and, of course, none to Abraham Lincoln. *Tribune Almanac and Political Register*, 1861, p. 49. From D. P. Bestor's comments on Breckinridge, Lincoln, and Douglas (letters of February 25 and June 27, 1861, below), it is clear that he supported Bell. On the contest in this state, see Percy L. Rainwater, *Mississippi, Storm Center of Secession, 1856-1861* (Baton Rouge, 1938).

²² Envelope postmarked Mobile, Alabama, December 10, 1860.

Our rail road will be finished from Mobile to the Mouth of the Ohio, by the first of Feb. thence, I suppose, to Chicago. We also have a road from Memphis to ours, and from Vicksburg to ours. From the Ohio to ours seems to me to be the right one. Corn, by way of New Orleans and Mobile is brought to this Country by thousands, but it requires so many re-shipments, and agents, that none but large dealers, can make it profitable. Cant you sack corn, send it to Cairo, thence down our road to Desoto? I thought I would try a hundred bushels, as an experiment, but I do not know about your roads. There is yet time to learn all about it, and inform each other.

I see your North western papers either ignorantly or willfully misrepresent the state of things in the South. Dont deceive yourself. An awful cloud hangs over this Republic. Those who have raised this storm can no more control it, than a child can control an elephant.

Yours

D. P. BESTOR

Mr. T. J. Bestor

Mobile Dec 9 / 60

Dear Brother;

We are here safely. There is nothing new. Congress is in a fine muss,²³ and no one has sense enough to get them out. I have just returned from preaching to a large congregation, and shall preach again to night.

Love to your Children

Yours

D P B.²⁴

Mobile Dec 21st 1860.

My Dear Brother;

We are well. I expect to start for Texas next week.

I send you some slips from our morning papers,²⁵ that you may see what is doing here.

Yours

D. P. BESTOR

[NEWSPAPER CLIPPING ENCLOSED WITH ABOVE LETTER]

It will be seen by our telegraph news that South Carolina is to day a foreign country. Foreign only in form, and bound to us by the act which has declared

²³ Congress had met on December 3, 1860.

²⁴ This postscript occupies the fourth page of the manuscript.

²⁵ Two clippings were enclosed, one of which is printed below. The other, headed "Domestic Intelligence. South Carolina Out!!!" consisted of news dispatches from Charleston, South Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; Montgomery, Alabama; Augusta, Georgia; and Jackson, Mississippi; all dated December 20, and all dealing with the secession of South Carolina on that day.

her independence of a copartnership which has been used to her detriment and to all of us of the South.

She has moved faster than the rest of our States, and that is her great merit: but, although a little slow, we think that Alabama will be soon by her side.

When the news of this act of the gallant little State came yesterday, there was a spontaneous movement to celebrate it. One hundred guns were fired from the Government street wharf by the Continentals within a half an hour after it was received, and the Light Infantry company and the Cadets paraded in full uniform and fired salutes in honor of the event.

A crowd gathered opposite the Battle House afterwards, and Judge Meek was forced to speak, and delivered one of his stirring speeches. He was enthused. Dr. Creagh also was called, and he was enthused. Mr. Price Williams was also called, and he, too, was enthused.

Altogether it was a multitude of enthusiasm.

Subsequently, the people were not disposed to go to bed; and finding some earnest and eloquent men about they gathered together again, and we had admirable speeches from Dr. Lyles, A. J. Requier, esq., the Rev. Mr. Collins, and Ben Lane Posey, esq. They were all moved by the inspiration of the general joy.

To night, we learn, there is to be a general illumination in honor of this majestic movement of South Carolina. It is the birth of a new nation, and deserves the honor which is to be given to it.

Mobile Jan 22d, 1861.

Dear Brother;

I have just returned from Texas, a great and beautiful Country. I am glad your money is useful.

You do not understand my allusion to the North Western Papers. Now I read them in our reading rooms, and I see that they are either ignorant or untruthful, in regard to the south.

I regard the National Intelligencer as the most reliable paper. I take the South-Western Baptist,²⁶ but like most of the *northern* religious papers it is sectional and slanderous. I took the New York Examiner,²⁷ but its want of candor and veracity made me quit it.

In times like these few men have wisdom enough to see things as they are. As to South Carolina, perhaps you think as well of her conduct, formerly, as I do. And I have no belief that *you* have the blood thirsty feelings of many politicians.

²⁶ The *Southwestern Baptist* (Montgomery, 1851-1865), was "edited through the war by Samuel Henderson, an ardent secessionist, who was forced to discontinue it by federal authorities." Frank L. Mott, *A History of American Magazines*, 3 vols. (New York: Cambridge, 1930-1938), II, 65n.

²⁷ Considered "the foremost force in American Baptist journalism" (characterization

Look at facts. South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ala. Miss. are gone.²⁸ Many others are fixing to go. I look upon the leaders (not the groundlings) of these great calamities, as the basest men that God permits to live.

New England will suffer most, because the South is her market. The north west will suffer, from the same cause, and will be humbled from having her great River in the hands of another nation. The south will suffer greatly, but has this advantage, that her market is mostly abroad. All of us will sink into second and third rate nations.

Look at Massachusetts. How are the mighty fallen. She proposes to give men and money to send down here to kill our people.²⁹ 'Tis fiendish to say the best of it. Suppose the South are wrong. They propose only to defend themselves. Do you think that these men will be regarded as soldiers? No, they will be regarded as murderers, and like John Brown and his murderers, they will meet their deserved fate. Britian could not conquer three millions. The world cannot conquer the South.

In vain we look to Congress. They are tinkering to no effect. The incoming Administration can do no better. They are to be pitied for their crimes, and laughed at for their weakness.

You do not take an interest in politics. How can you help it. Can you see the noblest Nation that ever existed destroyed, and this nation the inheritance of your Children, and feel careless about it. I pray God to destroy those who are destroying this glorious Union.

Yours truly
D. P. BESTOR

Mobile Jan 28, 1861.

Dear Brother;

I have just seen a friend of mine, who has been up to Illinois and Missouri to buy corn. He bought about four thousand sacs. It cost him, in this place, ninety four cents. 'Tis just as I supposed. One cannot get corn, up the river, and bring it by New Orleans, much cheaper than he can buy it here. A common boat cannot come here. Storms, on the Gulph, are as bad as on the ocean.

Our Rail Road is finished to Corinth, on the road from Memphis to Charleston, it will be finished to the mouth of the Ohio. What it will cost to send corn to Memphis, thence to Corinth, thence to Desoto, I have no means of knowing.

Probably transportation will be embarrassed in passing from one Republic quoted in Mott, *History of American Magazines*, II, 64), the New York *Examiner* was edited by Edward Bright from 1855 to 1894.

²⁸ Ordinances of secession had been passed by South Carolina, December 20, 1860; Georgia, January 19, 1861; Florida, January 10; Alabama, January 11; and Mississippi, January 9.

²⁹ See footnote 36, below.

to the other. The politicians north and south are so base that they seem incapable of doing any thing right. God has not cast the Devils out of *his* Empire, and I fear he will not cast them out of our Country.

I should be glad to learn, by Spring, what can be done, in sending corn by the Rail Roads.

Times are hard here. Confidence, in money matters, is lost, and one cannot borrow money, or sell property.

Cotton sells well, but the money is held fast. Our banks are safe and full of gold. Provisions are cheaper than usual.

The town is full of soldiers going to the forts, and marching through the streets. John has volunteered, and has gone to man the fort at Mobile point.³⁰ Suppose your Son should volunteer, and they should kill each other, who would be responsible? This case may be common. O! the wickedness of this sectionalism.

My heart bleeds for my country. Webster and Clay are gone, and God has given us over to fools and mad men.

Yours truly

D. P. BESTOR

Mobile Feb 2d 1861.

Dear Brother;

I am pained to learn from your letter that Brother Hibbard is sick. I wish he was at my farm where my Daniel and Julia now are, and would take pleasure in nursing him. Keep me informed of his situation.

As to a cold climate's being healthier than a warm one. It is, as we say here "all fudge". I wish your opinions were such, as to make it agreeable to you to live in Texas.

I have not been anxious about your "*opinions.*" I have wished you to know the state of opinion and feeling *in the South.*

Feeling has taken the place of reason, in both north and south. Congress can do nothing, whether it does right or wrong. The Committee of "thirty three" are as powerless as a babe.³¹ Mr. Seaward is gravely discussing the *right*

³⁰ Fort Morgan at Mobile Point had been occupied on January 5, 1861, prior to secession, by four companies from the Volunteer Regiment of Mobile, acting under orders of the governor of Alabama. *New York Times*, January 15, 1861, dispatch from Mobile, dated January 6. See also *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 326-27.

³¹ A special committee of thirty-three, one from each state, had been set up by the House of Representatives, on December 4, 1860, at the beginning of the session. It had made its report on January 14, 1861 (majority report in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, January 17, 1861), and debate had begun in the House on January 21.

of Secession,³² and the South is mustering its troops, calling its Congress, and adding State to State in its revolution;³³ and is paying no more attention to Seaward than to the crowing of a rooster. The threats of subduing the south remind one of the clown, who had a right to shear the wolf, and therefore he would shear him.

The Union is gone. The North will concede nothing. The South will ask too much. The North will loose all the slave States I think. The border states will demand of the North new securities for slaves. The North will not give these securities. That will drive the border slave states to the southern Republic. This is just what the Gulph states want.

Hence, it turns out just as I long since told you, that the Abolitionists and the Nulifiers were uniting to destroy the Union. O that God would save both sections from suicide. Vain is the help of man. We are well.

Yours truly

D. P. BESTOR

Mobile Feb 25th 61.

Dear Brother Thomas;

Your letters of the 10th and 17th are both at hand. They gratified me much in giving me the news of Brother's convalescence.

As to sending produce here, it now seems impracticable. While you inform me it is rising in Illinious [*sic*], it is falling here. Six weeks ago, corn was 90 cents, now it is 80 and falling. Mess pork was twenty two dollars, now it is 19. Shoulders were then 9 cents a pound, now they are 7. Every thing is falling here except cotton, that has risen one cent a pound, owing to its depending on a foreign market.

In the days of the Crusaders, but few men were found capable of rising above the prevailing fanaticism. I fear there are but few now. I did hope and believe that you were *one* of that few. I fear from yours of the 10th instant that I was mistaken.

How could you believe that ridiculous story, of an army's going to Washington. It originated in the same cowardice that let the British go there. Gen Scot, like an old dotard, is drumming and fifing about the city,³⁴ while the

³² A reference, doubtless, to William H. Seward's speech in the Senate, January 12, 1861. *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, January 14, 1861; Frederic Bancroft, *Life of William H. Seward*, 2 vols. (New York, 1900), II, 12-17.

³³ Since D. P. Bestor's letter of January 22, the two remaining states of the lower South had passed ordinances of secession—Louisiana, January 26, 1861; Texas, February 1. A call had been issued on December 27, 1860, for a convention of all the seceding states, and this assembled at Montgomery, on February 4, two days after the present letter.

³⁴ Washington was filled with rumors of possible attack. See, for example, "The Rumored Attack," in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, February 13, 1861, and "The Alleged Plot to Take Possession of the Capital," in *New York Times*, February 15, 1861. On February 11 the House of Representatives called upon President Buchanan

South has no more notion of going there, than of going to the moon. The south is preparing for defence, and not for offensive war.

If the North, under the hypocritical name of "enforcing the laws" fires a gun and kills our people, then we may expect to see civil war burst out like a volcano. Then Washington will be unsafe without a standing army. If you wish to know the policy of the South, Read President Davis's Inaugural.³⁵

Your opinion upon political rights, is clear and just. France had a right to vote herself a Master. Mexicans had a right to vote for Sectional Leaders, and disgrace, thereby, their Country. The Brackenridge and Lincoln men had a right to vote for Sectionalists, and to destroy the noblest edifice that human genius had ever erected.

I think with you that the north ought to have a southern State, but an appeal to justice, will not be heard now, either in the north or south.

You say the North is prospering, who must I believe *you*, or the twenty two thousand petitioners of Mass. So far as I can learn all are very seriously injured.

You appeal to the opinion of Washington. What a pity that appeal was not made by all the North, to his opinion on Sectionalism, as found in his Farewell address.

I have always been National; but I must go with my Country, much as I deprecate the folly of both sections.

Our Confederacy is a real Government; and will stay so. The danger now, is not separation, but the danger is war. You say that the North is not preparing for war. I hope you are not mistaken.

What is to be done with the men and money, voted by Mass, N. York and Ohio.³⁶ "O, they are for executing the laws." Well they come to Mobile and we will not let them into the City. They will shoot those who oppose them, and we will shoot back. What name do you call it? Now what is true of Mobile, is true of every port and ship.

The British said they were not going to make war upon Massachusetts they were only going to punish the Rebels. So they marched up Bunker Hill, and these Rebels shot back again. Now what do you call it? The North says it

to explain "the reasons that have induced him to assemble so large a number of troops in this city." *House Journal*, 36 Cong., 2 Sess., 298. General Winfield Scott had testified to a House committee on the matter earlier. See *New York Times*, February 1, 1861.

³⁵ Delivered at Montgomery, on February 18, 1861; text in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist, His Letters, Papers, and Speeches*, 10 vols. (Jackson, 1923), V, 49-53.

³⁶ On January 11, 1861, the legislature of New York had tendered to the President of the United States "whatever aid in men and money may be required to enable him to enforce the laws and uphold the authority of the Federal Government." Frank Moore (ed.), *The Rebellion Record; A Diary of American Events*, 11 vols. (New York, 1861-1868), I, "Documents," p. 21. A similar resolution had passed the Massachusetts legislature on January 18. *Ibid.*, I, "Diary of Events," p. 15.

is not war. A puppy nine days old, gets his eyes open, and when another puppy bites him, and he bites back, he knows it is war. If Mr. Lincoln really believed what he said in Indiana,³⁷ he has not yet got his eyes open.

I know you do not believe this northern nonsense. You know that the first blood shed, will be a declaration of war, and it will be a bloody one too.

I hope to see you this year.

Yours truly

D. P. BESTOR

I shall commence planting corn this week.³⁸

Mobile May 8th. 1861.³⁹

Dear Brother;

Enclosed I send you a report of our Railroad.⁴⁰ It is of great importance to me, and would be to both of us, were it not for the present troubles. My plantation is eight miles from the road, and about one hundred and fifteen from Mobile.

Our prospects for a crop are fair. Our corn is about knee high. My family is well.

I suppose Illinois, like the other States, is enjoying the beauties of Sectionalism.

You will admit me to be a Prophet.

Yours

D. P. BESTOR

Mobile May 10th 1861.

Dear Brother;

I saw to day an acquaintance, who has just been up through Illinois, for the purpose of purchasing produce, particularly corn. He did not purchase in Ill. in consequence of the troubles of the Country.

He purchased at St. Louis. He purchased several thousand bushels of corn at 36 cents a bushel. He then sent it to Columbus Kentucky. There it was put on our rail-road and sent to my County, Clark, Miss. It cost from St Louis to Clark 22 cents a bushel. Add this to the 36 and it makes 58 cents. Now the corn at Enterprise Clark Co. is worth 85 cents. About 25 cents a bushel

³⁷ Lincoln's speech at Indianapolis on February 11, 1861, in which he discussed the meaning of the words "coercion" and "invasion," was reported in the *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, February 14, 1861, and was the subject of a rather critical editorial in the same issue.

³⁸ This postscript is in the margin of the first page of the manuscript.

³⁹ Since D. P. Bestor's previous letter, ten weeks earlier, Lincoln had been inaugurated (March 4, 1861), Fort Sumter fired on (April 12), a call for 75,000 volunteers issued by Lincoln (April 15), and the blockade of southern ports proclaimed (April 19). See also footnote 43, below.

⁴⁰ The enclosure is missing.

was made on it. A fair profit. Good corn, in this town, can be bought for 75 cents. I have written this statement to you, not proposing to do any thing now, but to show you what may be done when the Country comes to its senses.

The *Intelligencer* of the 4th inst heads an article, "Starvation in Mississippi."⁴¹ Now the crops were bad in Miss. But corn is cheaper there than it was, this time last year. Potatoes are in perfection there now; And beeves are fat upon the commons.

I have just been reading Douglas's speech, in the same paper, before your Legislature.⁴² Now which am I to believe that he is ignorant, or that he lies. Much is said in the papers about taking Washington, and about conquering the South. But our Confederacy has never threatened to go beyond our own boundery. Does Douglass believe that a newspaper threat, is the act of the Government?

The war, which Lincoln is now waging upon us, may burst upon some of the free States, but we wish simply to be let alone. You see it is driving all the slave States to us. 'Tis not difficult to see what will be the success of conquering the South, since Virginia, Tennessee, and Arkansas, have also rebelled.⁴³ O, that a little common sense would come in fashion.

Yours

D. P. BESTOR

Mobile June 27th 1861.

My Dear Brother;

I see the fools, who manage the Postoffice, have concluded to let mail matter pass, so you *may* get this.

I received your letter. I see it is useless to warn you against believing the sensation papers. In similar papers, in the South, I read this story, "Abe Lincoln frequently becomes much terrified in his sleep. Jumps out of bed, in great consternation, runs about his room balling, Jeff Davis is after me, Jeff Davis is after me" Now if I should write this story to you as a serious fact, my letter would appear to you, just as your letter does to me.

⁴¹ *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, May 4, 1861; a dispatch from Chicago, based on information "from a gentleman just returned from Mississippi."

⁴² The "Speech of Mr. Douglas, on the Crisis, delivered before the Illinois Legislature," April 25, 1861, was printed in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, May 3, 1861. The *National Intelligencer*, to which D. P. Bestor subscribed, was the tri-weekly "country" edition of this paper, and the speech was carried in the issue of May 4.

⁴³ Ordinances of secession had been passed by Virginia on April 17, 1861; and Arkansas on May 6. Tennessee had ratified a military league with the Confederacy on May 7, a step as significant as the adoption of an ordinance of secession, which actually occurred on June 8. North Carolina, the last to take action, adopted its ordinance on May 20, ten days after the present letter was written. James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1937), 250-56.

I should like to know how you and Bro. H. are getting along these hard times. My family are well. My Son John is in the Army at Norfolk. Daniel and Frank are at home. Julia, my youngest Daughter is at home. Daniel is the Captain of a company at home, and is drilling it.⁴⁴

Our crops are the finest I ever saw. Corn is old enough to eat. Cotton is in bloom. Wheat, oats, potatoes are very fine. God is giving us produce, in this time of need, in great abundance. I have just received a letter from Judge Townes of Texas. He says that state will make grain enough to last two years.

The embargo, on the Miss. river,⁴⁵ seems to hurt one side as much as the other. The only article, which I use, raised in price, by the embargo, is pork.

Duglas, I see, is dead.⁴⁶ I wish all the scamps that broke up our union were dead. Lincoln was going to make no war. He was only going to take back U. States property. I told you then that he was blind as a young puppy. I think he must be getting his eyes open a little by this time.

I think the U. States north⁴⁷ will be fortunate, if they get out of this war and retain their liberty. Missouri and Maryland have already lost theirs.⁴⁸ How long will this war last? I think we can tell by the rule of three thus.

If boasting, bragging, and threatening to conquer the South for six months, does nothing; How long will it take to conquer eleven States.

Prices, excepting for meat and coffee, are about as usual. Money is scarce,

⁴⁴ See footnotes 8 and 9, above.

⁴⁵ See the instructions to customs officers issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, May 2, 1861, in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, May 13, 1861. Among the Bestor family papers in my possession is a pass issued by order of the provost marshal at Cairo, Illinois, August 11, 1862, to Mr. H. Bestor (probably the brother, Hibbard, mentioned in the present correspondence), permitting him "To leave Cairo by sail or river to go to Saint Louis, At own expense." On the back is the printed warning: "It is understood that the bearer accepts this Pass on his word of honor, that he is and will be ever loyal to the United States; and if found in arms against the Union, or in any way aiding her enemies the penalty will be Death."

⁴⁶ Stephen A. Douglas had died on June 3, 1861.

⁴⁷ The sentence was first written "the U. States will"; then the word "north" was written above the line, with a caret.

⁴⁸ On April 27, 1861, President Lincoln had authorized the commanding general to suspend the writ of habeas corpus if necessary, on "any military line . . . used between the city of Philadelphia and the city of Washington." James D. Richardson (ed.), *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 11 vols. (New York, 1911), V, 3219. In Missouri the most prominent case of military arrest up to the time of this letter had been that of Emmett MacDonald, captured by United States forces in an attack upon Camp Jackson in that state on May 10, 1861, and held despite a writ of habeas corpus which General William S. Harney refused to obey. See *Official Records*, Ser. II, Vol. I, pp. 114-16.

but tis good as gold. Our port is blockaded,⁴⁹ but it does no harm, until we want to ship cotton.

Love to your family

Yours

D. P. BESTOR

I shall leave Mobile. Direct, Prairie Line Jasper Co Miss.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ The confidential instructions of the Secretary of the Navy, June 8, 1861, had been that "Mobile . . . should be allowed no commercial privileges while the present condition of affairs continues." *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*, 30 vols. (Washington, 1894-1922), Ser. I, Vol. XVI, p. 529. By July 4, 1861, the commander of the U.S.S. *St. Louis* reported his vessel anchored off the entrance of Mobile Bay. *Ibid.*, 570.

⁵⁰ This postscript is in the margin of the third page of the manuscript.

Book Reviews

The Age of Jackson. By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945. Pp. xiv, 577. Appendix, bibliography. \$5.00.)

It is testimony to the fertility of the Jackson period as a field of research that it continues to yield worth-while books. Although the bibliography on the era may appear exhaustive, there are still many corners left for good diggings and some insufficiently explored points of view. *The Age of Jackson* represents a fresh approach to the subject and a considerable addition to the garner of facts. It is concerned with discovering the essence of Jacksonian democracy and what it was that gave it vitality. The author presents it as a succulent force in American life, and he traces its adventures. He is interested in the period for the insights it offers the present. He is at his best in his chapters on Jacksonian democracy in relation to such matters as law, industrialism, literature, and religion. The coverage is mainly from Jackson to Lincoln, but a panoramic perspective is given which stretches from Jefferson to Franklin Roosevelt.

The writing centers around the emergence of the demand for economic democracy, which became vocal and assertive during Jackson's second term. Considerable space is devoted to the part played by the eastern wage earners and their spokesmen in Jacksonian reform. The hard-money policy developed by the administration, says Mr. Schlesinger, was more popular among the industrial workers of the East than among Westerners. The West was opposed to the Bank of the United States but not to state banks, nor to the local issues of paper money. But the eastern workingmen, in their groping for a fairer distribution of wealth, turned against corporate monopolies as exemplified by banks, whether state or national. In Massachusetts the workingmen had been more concerned with grievances against mills than against the banks, but Jackson's veto of the United States Bank recharter bill made them take notice of the banking interests. Jackson's subsequent hard-money program also caught their fancy, and soon their leaders were swinging behind him, now believing that the workingmen's basic enemy was the capitalist or "associated wealth." They became identified with the struggle against not merely the Bank of the United States but all specially chartered institutions. George Bancroft deserted his aristocratic friends and went over to the Jacksonian democrats, leading the radical wing in 1836 on a workingmen's program.

The book emphasizes the conflict between the business community and the government which the hard-money policy and the independent treasury scheme

provoked. This marked a renewal of the clash between the Hamiltonian system and Jeffersonian principles. The position of the Jacksonians, says Schlesinger, was that the democratically elected government must have control over the business community in order to safeguard the life, liberty, and property of the humble citizens. "Jackson, ruling in the name of weak government, ended up by leaving the Presidency stronger than it had ever been before." In several respects "the Jacksonians revised the Jeffersonian faith for America. They moderated that side of Jeffersonianism which talked of agricultural virtue, independent proprietors, 'natural' property, abolition of industrialism, and expanded immensely that side which talked of economic equality, the laboring classes, human rights, and control of industrialism. This readjustment . . . made for a greater realism, and was accompanied by a general toughening of the basic Jeffersonian conceptions."

The Whigs, champions of Clay's Federalist American System, looked darkly upon the Jacksonian revolution, but they did not destroy it. Instead, they substituted for the class-conflict doctrines of Federalism the theory of the identity of class interests, and manufactured a folklore designed to lull the public into believing that the unrestricted wealth of the few was a benefit to the many. It was the sectional struggle that broke the continuity of Jacksonian principles. After the Civil War the business community captured the new Republican party and rode safely till the twentieth century, when Wilson and the two Roosevelts revived government for the general welfare. These men rejected the Jeffersonian idea of the weak state, and adopted government intervention in the Jacksonian tradition to protect the public from the over-mighty corporate interests.

One of the features of *The Age of Jackson* is the abundance of new material, particularly about little-known persons. Among them are William M. Gouge, Philadelphia journalist and economist, who "put the hard-money doctrines in the clearest form," and Seth Luther, George H. Evans, Theophilus Fisk, and Ely Moore, who were identified with the workingmen's movement. Moore was "the first labor leader to sit in the House of Representatives." Other men better known appear in a new light, especially the literary men who are presented as Jacksonians, such as Walt Whitman, William Cullen Bryant, James Fenimore Cooper, J. K. Paulding, William Leggett, Robert Dale Owen, John L. O'Sullivan, George Bancroft, A. H. Everett, and Orestes Brownson, the last being the subject of an earlier book by Mr. Schlesinger.

Both major and minor political figures receive fresh and imaginative treatment. Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky, who had a strong following among the workingmen, is presented as a champion of religious liberty and of the abolition of imprisonment for debt. The author rehabilitates the reputation of Van Buren, and labors hard to make a great liberal leader of him. He credits North Carolina with producing some of his most admired figures: Nathaniel

Macon, C. C. Cambreleng, Thomas Hart Benton, James K. Polk, and Jackson himself. His treatment of Polk is fair and informed. "Polk has been excelled by few Presidents in his ability to concentrate the energies of his administration toward the settlement of given ends," says Schlesinger. "He knew what he wanted and he got it."

Mr. Schlesinger's characterizations are sparkling and vivid, though perhaps they are not always valid. As examples, his characterization of Clay on page 83, and his disrobing of Greeley in Chapter 23 may provoke some protests. Written with verve and dash, arresting and felicitous phrasing, the book with its well-hewn theme should be stimulating reading for the intelligent layman. While the method is suggestive of the preacher with a text and a moral to point, it may be allowed that the moral should be pointed.

To the professional historian the book should offer some points of argument. The author's sallies at the "frontier" historians may be an example. He minimizes the West as a force in Jacksonian democracy, and holds that it was the industrial East that gave vitality to the "Jacksonian revolution." "The legend that Jacksonian democracy was an explosion of the frontier . . . does not explain the facts," says Schlesinger. With the enthusiasm of discovery the writer probably goes too far in his assertions about the East as a controlling and directional force. He asserts that the western leaders, including Polk, Carroll, and Benton, borrowed their ideas and solutions largely from the East (p. 208). One wonders if his conclusions do not arise from a too exclusive selection of materials. What was responsible for the shift in national leadership in 1828? The author does not even claim that the East was pivotal in raising Jackson to the Presidency. It is hard to see that the East contributed more than its proportionate part to the strength of Jacksonian democracy. In fact, it appears that it took the eastern workingmen about four years to discover Jackson, and that they climbed on the bandwagon after his policies on the Bank and money had been formed by fortuitous experience and the advice of Westerners. Not even a good case is made for Gouge's influence on Jackson, though it is evident that this hard-money advocate influenced a great many to follow him. In other words, Jackson, a national rather than a sectional leader, developed policies and a program that had an intersectional appeal, as well as intersectional opposition. It was, indeed, a program that appealed to all who at the moment were at grips with corporations or exclusive wealth, including the eastern wage earners. But it also appealed to many others for various reasons. Mr. Schlesinger is probably on safer ground when he says that "more can be understood about Jacksonian democracy if it is regarded as a problem not of sections but of classes." Perhaps the industrial discontent of the East did give greater validity to Jacksonian policies as time went on, but this does not gainsay the role of the frontier in promoting the man who formulated them.

One of the refreshing things about the book is that its author dares say

something good about the so-called spoils system. "Its historical function," he writes, "was to narrow the gap between the people and the government—to expand popular participation in the workings of democracy." This is a gratifying recognition of a fact long ignored by writers. It substitutes a realistic appraisal for moralistic reproach or apologetic approval. Rotation in office was regarded at the time of Jackson as a measure of reform, and one who has studied the policy-making Jacksonians thoroughly can hardly doubt that most of them were fiercely earnest and sincere in this interpretation of it.

The Age of Jackson is amply documented, with an excellent bibliography, and a good index. There are some minor errors, particularly the undeviating reference to the *Globe* as the "*Washington Globe*." The title is not only incorrect, but it misses the significance of the newspaper's name. The article *the* stood in the title as though it were proudly proclaiming that no place-name was needed. There are some questionable interpretations, too, such as the implication that Hugh Lawson White broke with Jackson because of his hard-money policy. But these slight faults scarcely detract from the general excellence and distinctive value of the book.

University of Chattanooga

CULVER H. SMITH

The South Carolina Rice Plantation as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston. Edited by J. H. Easterby. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Pp. xxi, 478. Frontispiece, calendar, map. \$5.00.)

To the present the publication of source materials concerning South Carolina rice plantations and planters has been largely neglected. Professor Easterby has helped to remedy this lack for the period 1810-1868 by the publication of these Allston family records. With this volume there is added to the sources for the study of southern agriculture and southern history generally a most significant, judiciously selected collection of personal and business correspondence, slave records, overseers' reports, and miscellaneous documents dealing with plantation life. In the future, lack of readily available source materials will not be an acceptable excuse for a writer who fails to present the story of the South Carolina rice plantation in its heyday.

The editor presents in his introduction a succinct and scholarly discussion of the Georgetown District, the Allston family, the Allston Papers, the plantations, the overseers, the slaves, rice production and marketing, and plantation finance. The documents are divided into five general categories: family correspondence, overseers' reports and related documents, slave documents, factors' correspondence, and "Miscellany." The last section contains such items as a brief diary, post-Civil War tenant letters, speeches, and a list of the contents of a plantation wine room. The materials in each section are presented in

chronological sequence, and for further chronological guidance the editor has provided a calendar of all the records contained in the volume.

The scope of the volume is the period 1810-1868, but the documents are unevenly distributed as to date. For example, the years 1824-1834 and 1839-1849 are represented hardly at all, about two-thirds of the family correspondence falls between 1850 and 1868, and over half of the overseers' reports are for the year 1864. Utilization of the introduction in close conjunction with the records, however, provides an insight into the developments of the whole period. The title which Professor Easterby has given his volume may mislead some who are not particularly interested in plantation development, but a researcher would be unwise to neglect it, regardless of his specific interests. Since Robert F. W. Allston was in political office almost continuously from 1828 to 1858, a collection of his papers could hardly be otherwise than rich in political discussion. As a result of the prominence and wide acquaintance of the family a variety of subjects and persons appear in the Allston correspondence.

At one time Allston controlled seven large plantations. He was a progressive farmer, if not a scientific one. He selected seed carefully, fertilized heavily, avoided overcropping, and attempted in general to preserve his soil. Although some experimentation was carried out, Allston was apparently satisfied with the accepted methods; therefore, the records present a routine typical to most South Carolina rice plantations. Diversification resulted primarily from an attempt to make the plantations as nearly self-sufficient as possible, particularly during the Civil War. Normally, rice production was the controlling interest of the planter, his family, the overseers, and the slaves. The extent to which the life of the Georgetown District revolved around rice is illustrated by a remark made in the 1820's: "Rice fell badly, and that depresses the spirits of the Majority of the People here, whose chief object is to make Rice to buy Negroes and Buy Negroes to make Rice" (p. 54). Thus rice was substituted for the sugar or cotton of other areas in this maxim of southern economy.

Allston was a large slaveowner, even for the Georgetown District. At the time of his death he owned 590 slaves, a number that had resulted from inheritances, purchases, natural increase, and few sales. He and his family mixed kindness with sternness in dealing with their "people," but emphasis was placed on rewards for good service rather than on punishment for bad. Slaves were worked steadily but not with undue strenuousness. Extra allowances were granted for unusual services. Slaves who were not absent from work during the year were rewarded; but there were few who received this prize, for Negroes were in no way immune from the diseases of the rice planting area. Allston utilized the services of physicians generously. In this connection, a revealing document, which is indicative of the information that may be derived from these records, shows that the charges for medical services on one plantation for 1853 was \$390.21. In the month of January the doctor visited the plantation

on 26 days; in May and June he came 15 times in 33 days to treat the same slave. The seriousness of the case and the age of the patient as well as the time of the call affected the charge, but one wonders how the doctor arrived at such precise fees as \$2.95, \$3.45, \$3.95, \$4.45, and particularly the one of \$3.31, for mileage, presence, and "six powders for Anny" (pp. 342-44).

Although the overseers' reports and correspondence are not distributed equally over the years, this is in some respects fortunate. The editor was able to present for 1864 the reports from two plantations for almost every two-week period. The year was by no means typical, but apparently there was an effort to follow established routine, and unusual problems and departures from the normal were discussed. Allston's overseers were little different from those found elsewhere in the South. They lacked education but not intelligence and practical knowledge. Several remained in service for long periods, which indicated that Allston's policy of liberal wages and considerate treatment was wise.

Allston's relationships with his factors was close both in personal and business affairs. They served him in all the customary capacities: banker, purchasing agent, investment broker, salesman, adviser, and informant. He was somewhat unique in three respects, however, in that he relied upon only two firms during his planting career, he seldom became indebted to them, and he rarely indulged in acrimonious correspondence with them. The factors' records are more extensive for the critical periods of 1835-1838 and 1859-1868, which adds to their value.

There is a preponderance of material in the records for the period from 1850 to 1868, much of it political. Allston joined wholeheartedly in the attempt to preserve what he believed were the constitutional rights of the southern states. He hoped that a strong, concerted movement would result from the Nashville Convention and would cause the northern people to stop their obstinate criticisms of the South. Disappointed here, he supported the movement to settle slaveholders in Kansas. When war came Allston and his family loyally defended the southern "cause."

The correspondence of the war period, the reports of overseers, and letters of factors show the now familiar picture of the approach of ruin. The threat of Union troops, the blockade, the worries of providing food and clothing for the family and the slaves were primary topics of discussion. With the death of Allston in 1864, the responsibility for managing the plantation fell almost solely to Mrs. Allston. Economic desperation and the degradation and loss of morale among the slaves becomes more evident as the end of the war approached.

These records tend to support the story of reconstruction as presented in previous scholarly studies. The fear of harm from irresponsible Negroes, the conviction that they would not behave as freedmen, the rumors of plots to massacre the whites, and the desire for the end of political turmoil are here. Mrs. Allston, who continued largely to manage the family's affairs, took a more

rational view of the situation than did many Southerners. She came to the conclusion at one time that it would be more efficacious to hire Negroes rather than whites as agents for the plantations. It would not only be more economical, she believed, but also "Negroes will soon be placed upon an exact equality with ourselves, and it is in vain for us to strive against it" (p. 226). Benjamin Allston, the son who had served with the Confederate army, found it difficult to settle down to the mundane and disheartening tasks of the farmer. Several prominent people offered solutions to his personal problems and those of the South. He took an active interest in the immigration schemes of the time, hoping to utilize immigrants on the plantation and part time in a proposed cotton factory. Oliver H. Kelley, founder of the Patrons of Husbandry, advised Ben to enter politics. "If the Negro predominates in your district," Kelley wrote, "and their vote is to carry the day, make yourself popular with them and *get their votes*, the color of the votes is of little consequence so long as good sensible white men are elected by them." He also counseled: "Never mind the apathy and nervousness of your neighbors, go in for *number one*" (p. 232). There is some indication that for a time Ben was impressed by this advice.

The editor of this volume has rendered an invaluable service to historians. He might have increased the usefulness of the documents had he provided a more complete, analytical index and had he added more comments and interpretations in the footnotes. There are a number of minor discrepancies between the printed documents and the quotations from them in the Introduction. More care in this matter of detail would have left no question as to the accuracy with which the manuscripts have been transferred to the printed page.

Tulane University

FRED C. COLE

Seargent S. Prentiss, Whig Orator of the Old South. By Dallas C. Dickey. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1945. Pp. xiv, 422. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

However else it may have been impoverished, the Old South was never at a loss for something to say. In fact, that South where such orators as Seargent S. Prentiss flourished was pleased to shelter its life in a stately mansion of words built of polite conversation and public oratory, both of which served as a castle for pleasurable living and verbal defense against the hostile "Northern barbarian." Although an "invader" himself, Seargent S. Prentiss lent a hand as zealously as any native-born Southerner in the "word-raisings" of his adopted country; and even though one may question his ever really adopting the South as wholeheartedly as did such northern-born "professional Southerners" as John Anthony Quitman, the South seems to have adopted him, and that without reservation.

Outwardly, at least, Prentiss was part of the environment in which he had chosen to live, or, to put it more bluntly, to make his fortune; but even amid

the alien cotton, he had thoughts of Maine and to his family he professed a desire eventually to return. Yet, it was only in adversity that he cultivated his nostalgia; and when he did shake Mississippi dust from his boots, it was to go to New Orleans. On the slavery issue, Prentiss' views were proper, but certainly not extreme; and one feels that he accepted slavery with the pushbutton conviction of the legal mind. At any rate, Prentiss could be *in* but not too much *of* the South, and possessing his New England soul, he could still please his audience whether it were in the Mississippi legislature or in Faneuil Hall. The portrait of Prentiss now afforded us by Professor Dickey's biography suggests the adaptability and compromising nature of this uprooted New Englander. For a man of such parts, of course, the Whig party had been wrought; and among the gentry of Natchez and Vicksburg, Prentiss became the Whig of Whigs.

In both state and national politics, Sargent Prentiss did yeoman service to Whiggery. He led the Whigs of Southwest Mississippi in resisting the political ascendancy of the Democratic counties of North Mississippi. He was a vigorous opponent of repudiation of state bank bonds. In Congress he espoused the United States Bank and fought the financial policies of the Jacksonians. At election time, Prentiss was ready with campaign oratory, which he expended far and wide throughout the Union. Even though his career in the legislature and in Congress was very brief, his influence in politics remained great, and Henry Clay held him in high regard.

In the realm of law Prentiss succeeded brilliantly, thanks to his oratorical persuasiveness. Like the party to which he was committed, he was less a man of principle than of principles, adapting himself before the bar as at the hustings where expediency demanded. With his legal successes came wealth, much of it as the result of speculation; but like the state of his adoption, Prentiss was guilty of financial indiscretions which spelled his eventual ruin—a debacle not entirely unassociated with his strong predilection for liquor, but ultimately to be attributed to the fact that Prentiss was, as Dickey concludes, a plain "financial fool."

Above all else, Prentiss was an orator; and from his vast storehouse of eloquence he could produce speeches of three or four hours' consistency. His speech was highly decorated with Biblical and classical allusion in the manner of his day; but behind the neo-classical façade of his oratory lay the rough-hewn timbers of American colloquialism, and when occasion demanded Prentiss could employ the rough and tumble vocabulary of the bumpkin.

Dickey has reconstructed Prentiss for us from remains that are unfortunately fragmentary. Even the speeches on which Prentiss' fame rests are in but sketchy form, the real Prentiss often having gone out of them in the reverse alchemy of a slow reportorial hand. Even so, there is a deal too much of phrasing and paraphrasing of the oratory in Dickey's study. Probably, too, in

his preoccupation with the oratory, Dickey has recovered less of the spirit than the word; for one fails to comprehend, even in the chapter on "Prentiss the Man," what made Prentiss tick—what his political ways and means were, what sort of person he was "in liquor" and among friends. Had Dickey been able to unearth more Prentiss correspondence and more contemporary diaries and memoirs, the "real" Prentiss might be much less vague to us. The resort to oral legend in the closing chapters certainly suggests a much more vivid personality than has been exhumed here, for the living Prentiss seems to have gone with the oratory.

As a piece of historical scholarship, Dickey's study is sober, painstaking, and thorough within the limits imposed by the sources used. The extant speeches and political utterances, together with the major legal remains, have been collected, digested, and codified for us in this monograph. For these much-needed mercies, the historian will be truly thankful.

Mississippi State College

JOHN K. BETTERSWORTH

Horticulture and Horticulturists in Early Texas. By Samuel Wood Geiser. (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1945. Pp. vi, 100. Bibliography. \$1.50.)

The announcement of the publication of another book from the pen of Samuel Wood Geiser can be considered as assurance that again a good book has been written and that a vast amount of painstaking research has gone into it. Not only that, but one knows that the book will be readable and interesting. Although this book is brief, it reveals the qualities just mentioned.

The author asserts that his chapters on Texas horticultural journalism and horticultural societies are incomplete and that "horticultural crop-movements and shifts in the State and the rise and decline of commercial orcharding" are not discussed. Certainly this incompleteness and these omissions keep the study from being definitive, but one can feel reasonably sure that what Professor Geiser did not find on Texas horticultural journalism and horticultural societies just simply does not exist. Probably nothing, or else very little more, will ever be found on these incomplete and untreated topics. The fact remains, then, that perhaps after all this is the nearest possible approach to a definitive study. The additional information that might be gleaned from the ledgers and account books of commercial orchardists would probably be so inconsequential as not to warrant further treatment.

The study is divided into two parts. The first is a historical treatise on horticulture in early Texas. Its seven chapters cover an introduction, two chapters on horticultural societies and journalism, respectively, three chapters entitled "Fruit Culture in Early Texas, 1820-1850," "Census Reports for Fruit Crops in Texas, 1850-1890," and "Wild Fruits in Early Texas," and a bibliog-

raphy. The second part is biographical and comprises two-thirds of the book. It contains sketches on 145 individuals, most of whom were either orchardists or horticultural journalists. The thirteen medical practitioners listed in the book generally pursued horticulture as a hobby, and a few others listed definitely followed horticulture more as a hobby than as an occupation. A few of the men came directly to Texas from European countries under the influence of publications about Texas.

An exact count of the horticultural varieties originated and introduced reveals a total of 252 (pp. 99-100). Peaches, plums, grapes, and pecans outnumber all of the other varieties. Thomas Volney Munson of Denison, Texas, was easily the most outstanding horticulturist in originating and introducing varieties of grapes. He wrote *Foundations of American Grape Culture* and contributed many articles to horticultural journals. Gilbert Onderdonk of Nursery, Victoria County, who originated and introduced seven varieties of peaches and eleven of plums, was second only to Frank Taylor Ramsey of Austin, who originated and introduced at least sixteen varieties of peaches and twenty-six of plums. The state's pecan king was Edmond E. Risien of San Saba, who originated at least thirteen varieties of pecans. Orchardists who contributed generously to horticultural magazines included, besides the four men just named, Thomas Affleck, Elbert W. Kirkpatrick, Dr. Andrew McFerrin Ragland, Dr. William Wynne Stell, Nathaniel Stevens, Henry Martyn Stringfellow, Joseph W. Stubenrauch, and David H. Watson.

Those who have an interest in the subject of this book, either from the historical or the scientific standpoint, are indebted to Professor Geiser for having made the study. To repeat, this is a good book, and it will have its place in Texana. It should stimulate other writers to produce books on various periods and phases of agriculture in Texas.

University of Texas

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

A History of Tusculum College, 1794-1944. By Allen E. Ragan. ([Greeneville, Tennessee]: Tusculum Sesquicentennial Committee, 1945. Pp. x, 274. Illustrations, bibliographical note.)

Many years ago Philip Lindsley, president of the University of Nashville, in the somewhat hyperbolic language of the day, wrote: "We, the University, live forever! And generations yet unborn shall rejoice in our triumphs, and pronounce the eulogium which our labors shall have nobly won." This book, which was prepared in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of Tusculum College, is a record of the triumphs and troubles of one of the numerous small colleges which have made definite contributions to the advancement of education in the South. It is also a eulogy of Charles O. Gray, president of Tusculum College during its period of greatest development, 1908 to 1931. In his brief history Professor Ragan summarizes the founding and development of one of

the oldest colleges in the Old Southwest, gives lists of prominent teachers and trustees, facts on enrollment and fees, and comments on the changing curriculum and educational philosophy of the college.

In its development Tusculum followed a pattern quite familiar in the history of the early colleges of the area. Founded as academies whose chief aim was the training of ministers, most of these institutions grew slowly, ridden by debt and doctrinal strife. They often attempted union with neighboring institutions, with varying degrees of success. They stubbornly defended the classical A.B. degree, but by 1870 most of them had accepted the less rigorous B.S. Kept open by the sacrifice of administrative officials and faculty members and the donations of philanthropic friends, these schools profoundly affected the lives of thousands of men and women.

The total enrollment of Tusculum College has never exceeded 348 (in 1940-1941). Women were first admitted in 1880, but by 1939 almost half the students were women. Prior to 1925 most of the students were from eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina, but since that time there has been a steady increase in the number of registrants from northern and eastern states. In 1925 there were only six from that area, but in 1940 almost fifty per cent of the student body was from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania alone. Professor Ragan attributes this increased enrollment of northern students to the moderate fees at Tusculum in contrast to the high costs at eastern schools. Yet he states that Tusculum has found it difficult to compete with near-by colleges whose fees are less than the \$445 charged by Tusculum for tuition, board, and room in 1941. The increase in students from the northern and eastern states in attendance at southern colleges has not been confined to Tusculum. Further examination of the underlying factors responsible for this shift might be worthy of further study if, indeed, such a study has not already been made.

Washington, D. C.

HENRY L. SWINT

Historical News and Notices

Committee appointments for the Southern Historical Association for the year 1946 have been made as follows: *Committee on Program*: Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, chairman; Robert W. Barnwell, Jr., Murray State Teachers College; Bell I. Wiley, University of Mississippi; Austin L. Venable, Winthrop College; and J. Wesley Hoffmann, University of Tennessee. *Committee on Nominations*: Rosser H. Taylor, Furman University, chairman; Charles H. Ambler, West Virginia University; Rudolph L. Bieseke, University of Texas; Christopher Crittenden, North Carolina Department of Archives and History; and Blanche Clark Weaver, Arlington, Virginia. *Committee on Membership*: Ottis C. Skipper, Northwestern State College (Louisiana), chairman; other members to be announced later. *Committee on Local Arrangements*: Henry T. Shanks, Birmingham-Southern College, chairman; other members to be named by the chairman.

PERSONAL

Charles S. Sydnor, of Duke University, has been awarded a Library of Congress grant-in-aid for the completion of his study of the development of southern sectionalism, 1819-1848. He is now on leave of absence from Duke, and is engaged in research work in Washington.

Thomas D. Clark, of the University of Kentucky, has been adjudged the winner of the 1945 McClung Award, which is given each year to the author of the best article published in the *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*. His prize-winning article was on "The Country Store in Post-Civil War Tennessee."

Fred C. Cole, formerly of Louisiana State University, who was serving as the managing editor of the *Journal of Southern History* before accepting a commission in the Navy in September, 1942, has recently received his discharge from the service. He has accepted an appointment as associate professor of history at Tulane University, and will assume the duties of his new position in February.

New appointments which have been announced are: Horace Montgomery, recently discharged from the Navy, to be visiting professor of history at Oglethorpe University; Malcolm C. McMillan, a graduate student at the University of North Carolina, to be instructor in history at North Carolina State College; Thomas B. Alexander, now on terminal leave from Naval service, to be in-

structor in history at Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College; Gene A. Hollon, a graduate student at the University of Texas, to be assistant professor of history at the University of Oklahoma; Benson W. Davis, formerly of Meredith College, to be professor of philosophy and history at John B. Stetson University; Duane Koenig to be assistant professor and Eva A. Thomas to be instructor in history at the University of Miami; T. Conn Bryan to be instructor in history at the University of Tennessee; and Kenneth O. Walker to be associate professor of history at Goucher College.

F. Garvin Davenport, who was on leave of absence from Transylvania College during the fall and winter terms to lecture at Colgate University, has been granted an additional leave for the spring term to give the Lincoln Lectures on American Civilization at Knox College. He plans to return to Transylvania College in June.

Earl S. Pomeroy, formerly of the University of North Carolina, has been appointed assistant professor of history at Ohio State University.

Harold E. Briggs, of the University of Miami, has accepted an appointment as professor of history and chairman of the department at Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale; and Charlton W. Tebeau has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of history at the University of Miami.

Among those who have recently returned to academic life from leaves of absence for service in connection with the war are: E. Malcolm Carroll, of Duke University, who has been with the Office of Strategic Services for the past three years; Horace C. Peterson, of the University of Oklahoma, who has received his discharge from the Army after having served as military attaché at Buenos Aires; Henry H. Simms, of Ohio State University, who has been with the Historical Division of the Army Air Forces; James W. Silver, of the University of Mississippi, who has been on overseas duty with the American Red Cross; William R. Hogan, of Louisiana State University, after more than three years' service in the Army; Glover Moore, of Mississippi State College, who has been in the Army since early in 1942; and Weymouth T. Jordan, of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, following service in the Navy since 1943.

T. Harry Williams, of Louisiana State University, has been named as editor of the *Southern Biography Series*, sponsored by the University and formerly edited by Wendell H. Stephenson and Fred C. Cole.

John P. Dyer, of Savannah, Georgia, has been appointed chairman of the Fourth Regional History committee of the Office of Price Administration. The work of this committee will be to collect and edit the material for a history of OPA in the southeastern states and to write the history. The office of the committee is to be in Atlanta, and the states included in the scope of the study

are Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Colonel Lucien Beckner, consulting geologist and director of the City Museum in the Louisville Free Public Library, has been named secretary of the Filson Club and editor of the *Filson Club History Quarterly* to succeed Otto A. Rothert, who retired on September 1, 1945, after twenty-eight years of service.

The Archivist of the United States has announced the transfers of the following staff members: John G. Bradley, who has served as chief of the Division of Motion Pictures and Sound Recordings since 1935, to become director of the Motion Picture Project of the Library of Congress; Theodore R. Schellenberg, who has served as chief of the Division of Agriculture Department Archives since 1938, to become records officer of the Office of Price Administration; and Jesse E. Boell, assistant director of the War Records Office, to accept a position as archives officer with the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section of the United States Group, Control Council (Germany). Henry H. Eddy, on leave from the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, resigned to become archivist of the State of New York. Virginia E. Massey, formerly on the staff of the Historical Records Survey Projects and more recently on that of the Office of Strategic Services, was appointed to the staff of the National Archives and Fred G. Halley has returned after receiving an honorable discharge from the Army. Dallas D. Irvine, formerly management officer of the National Archives, has become assistant director of the War Records Office and Arthur E. Young is acting management officer.

Alto Lee Whitehurst, professor of history at the University of Alabama, died on October 31, 1945. After receiving the M.A. degree at the University of Alabama in 1924, he became an instructor in history and political science there, and was promoted through the various ranks, being made professor of history in 1934. He received the Ph.D. degree in history at the University of Chicago in 1932, his dissertation being a study of Martin Van Buren and the Free Soil Movement. His teaching interests were in the field of advanced American history, in which he attained a reputation as a conscientious and effective teacher.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

At its meeting in Washington on December 27, 1945, the Council of the American Historical Association established the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship, to be awarded annually, beginning in 1946, for the best original manuscript, either complete or in progress, on American history. By American history is meant the history of the United States, Latin America, and Canada. The Fellowship has a cash value of \$1000, plus a royalty of 5 per cent after cost of publication has been met. The winning manuscript in each annual com-

petition will be published without cost to the author in the series of Beveridge Fund publications; other manuscripts also may be so published in the discretion of the Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, which is charged with the administration of the Fellowship. As small a part as one half of the manuscript may be submitted at the time of application, but it must be accompanied by a detailed outline of the balance. The deadline for the submission of applications and manuscripts in the first year of competition (1946) is September 1, 1946. For full details and forms of application, address Arthur P. Whitaker, Chairman, Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund of the American Historical Association, 208 College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

The Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, announces that it has taken over the Fellowship program of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, and is prepared to provide a limited number of grants-in-aid of research in the field of Early American History and Culture to the year 1815. These grants will be available to those who have a definite project of research in progress. Applications must be received by May 1, 1946; announcements of awards will be made June 1, 1946. Information and forms for application may be procured from the Director of the Institute, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The program of the fifth annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History, held in Indianapolis on November 7-8, 1945, included two sessions of much more than local interest. In a session devoted to the topic of "Local History and the Schools," H. Bailey Carroll, of the University of Texas, described the Texas Junior Historical Association, the purpose of which is "to promote the history and tradition of Texas"; Sylvester K. Stevens, state historian of Pennsylvania, outlined the experience of his state in utilizing local history in the schools; Gertrude Gove, of St. Cloud, Minnesota, described the "Minnesota History Project," which is being undertaken by the high school students of St. Cloud; Paul Seehausen, of the Indiana Department of Education, told of the plans for including a study of state history in the proposed social studies curriculum for Indiana; and Colton Storm, of the William L. Clements Library, presented a paper on "History and Higher Education." In another session, dealing with some of the problems of the recent war, Marvin W. Schlegel, of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, discussed the writing of the history of the war, and Virgil V. Peterson, of the Colorado State Historical Society, described aspects of the effects of the war upon the western part of the United States.

At the November meeting of the East Tennessee Historical Society, Verton M. Queener presented a paper on "The Republican Party in East Tennessee, 1900-1914"; the program for December was a paper on "The History of the Small

Communities in Knox County," by Nannie Lee Hicks; and in January, Harvey Broome, the president of the Society, read a paper on "Knox County Government, 1860-1900." At the annual business meeting, held in December, all officers were re-elected, Leo J. Zuber, of the University of Tennessee, was named as a new member of the executive committee, and Leroy P. Graf was appointed to serve as editorial associate for the Society's *Publications*.

The Florida Historical Society held a joint meeting with the Florida Academy of Sciences on December 7 and 8, 1945, at St. Augustine. Among the papers of historical interest were: "The Inauguration of the First Governor of the State of Florida," by Daisy Parker; "A Confederate Newspaper in Mexico," by Alfred J. Hanna; "Territorial St. Augustine," by Mrs. E. W. Lawson; "Florida Firms of 1945 Established before Statehood," by Dena Snodgrass; "General Military Affairs as They Affected St. Augustine in Territorial Days," by Albert C. Manucy; "A History of Medicine in Duval County," by Webster Merritt; and "Advertisements Read by Floridians One Hundred Years Ago," by William T. Cash.

A group of about thirty historians and laymen interested in history met at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on November 16, 1945, to revive and reorganize The Historical Society of North Carolina, which first came into existence just a century ago and continued to function until about 1915. The new organization adopted a constitution and by-laws, and elected the following list of officers: Alice M. Baldwin, of Duke University, president; Frontis W. Johnston, of Davidson College, vice-president; Cecil Johnson, of the University of North Carolina, secretary-treasurer; and as members of the executive committee, Archibald Henderson, of the University of North Carolina, Christopher Crittenden, of the North Carolina Department of Archives and History, William T. Polk, of Greensboro, and James W. Patton, of North Carolina State College. Plans were made for a meeting of the Society, to be held in Raleigh in the spring, at which a program will be presented.

At the monthly meeting of the Tennessee Historical Society for December, Judge Frank H. Gailor presented a paper on "Sewanee before the Civil War." The paper for the January meeting was by Donald Davidson, on "The Tennessee River in the Civil War." The annual election of officers, held at the January meeting, resulted in the re-election of all officers except the treasurer, Sam M. Fleming, of Nashville, being elected to that office to succeed Mrs. John H. DeWitt, who had resigned.

The Virginia World War II History Commission published in October, 1945, a twelve-page circular entitled *Writing Your Community's War History: Some Suggestions on Content and Sources of Information*, designed primarily to assist the local historians in about thirty of Virginia's counties and cities who are work-

ing on local war history projects which the Commission has stimulated. The circular includes a somewhat detailed outline for local war histories which might be of interest to readers outside of Virginia. The Commission will be glad to send a copy of it to interested persons or agencies upon request addressed to it at the University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville.

The commission has elected W. Edwin Hemphill, formerly assistant director, to serve as director, succeeding Lester J. Cappon, whose resignation became effective at the end of 1945.

The committee on awards of the American Association for State and Local History, set up in 1944 to select the best examples of research and writing in local or regional history published in state historical journals during that year, has given first place to Isabel Howell, for her "John Armfield of Beersheba Springs," which appeared in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (March-June, 1944). Three other articles were judged worthy of honorable mention, in the following order: Whitney R. Cross, "Mormonism in the 'Burned-Over District'," in *New York History* (July, 1944); E. Bruce Thompson, "Richard Abbey and the Methodist Publishing House," in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July, 1944); and Thomas E. Dabney, "The Butler Regime in Louisiana," in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April, 1944). The panel of judges consisted of Albert E. Corey, New York State Historian, Charles M. Gates, of the University of Washington, Seattle, and Philip D. Jordan, of the University of Minnesota.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be of interest to students of southern history and closely related fields: one additional box of the papers of Roger Sherman, 1754 to 1808; five boxes of the papers of the Barnard family of Connecticut and New York, 1757 to 1890; photostats of two letters of George Washington to John Sullivan, May 20, and July 22, 1778, and one to Baron von Steuben, April 12, 1782; photostat of a letter of Count d'Estaing to Silas Deane, May 25, 1778; a letter and a memorandum of Patrick Henry to Mrs. Martha Fontaine, October 2, 1791, and February 4, 1794, respectively; letter of Richard M. Johnson to John Armstrong, October 19, 1814; five rolls of microfilms of the papers of José Miguel Carrera, 1815 to 1821; letter of Zachary Taylor to Hancock Taylor, July 6, 1817; three additional boxes of papers of John Ericsson, 1821, 1836 to 1889; letter of Levi Woodbury, December 25, 1830; four pages of autograph notes of George Washington concerning agriculture, with letter of Christopher Hughes to Hamilton Fitzgerald, June 1, 1830; letter of Jared Sparks to W. M. Meredith, January 30, 1837; one reel of microfilms of papers of the Hayden family of Windsor, Connecticut, 1838 to 1844; six documents and letters and one account book

of Sewell W. Hopkins, of Maine, October 14, 1841, to December 4, 1861; letter of Henry Clay to James B. Watkins, October 31, 1842; agreement between Charles Wilkes and the artist and engraver, Alfred Jones, to engrave a steel picture of the "Samoa Dance" by June 15, 1843; one box of the papers of Alexander B. McFarlan, 1843 to 1865; fourteen additional boxes of the papers of Henry Ward Beecher, 1843 to 1885; letter from George Washington Parke Custis to William E. Robinson, March 14, 1846; letter of Millard Fillmore, August 19, 1848; one box of additional papers of Cadmus Marcellus Wilcox, 1848 to 1890; journal of the Reverend Obed Dickinson, October 16 to December 6, 1852; autograph draft of telegram of Abraham Lincoln to George B. McClellan, September 12, 1862; two additional boxes of the papers of James Jenkins Gillette, 1862 to 1881; two boxes of the papers of William Conant Church, 1862 to 1917 (restricted); letter of Ralph Waldo Emerson to W. C. Foster, April 16, 1863; two letters of Louis Elseffer to members of his family, January 18, 1865, and February 13, 1885; plat of the farm, and drawing of the house in Caroline County, Virginia, where John Wilkes Booth died; letter from James P. Bogart to J. E. Hilgard, August 9, 1880; six boxes of genealogical data of the Wakefield family, 1881 to 1927; one volume of papers of Gouverneur Kemble Warren: "Proceedings of a Public Meeting of Soldiers of the late War, August 12, 1882"; one box of the papers of Wendell Willkie; nine large wooden boxes of the papers of John Leonard Hines (restricted); and two boxes of additional papers of William Jennings Bryan, including "Biographical Notes, His Speeches, Letters and other Writings," by Grace Dexter Bryan.

The Maryland Historical Society has recently acquired an important group of Carroll family papers, perhaps the most significant item being a letterbook of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, covering the years 1765-1768. This volume contains copies of forty-five letters written to friends in England soon after Carroll's return to live in Maryland, which include numerous comments on the political situation in America and the reaction to the Stamp Act and to taxation in general. The collection also contains many letters of a more strictly personal nature, as well as correspondence of other members of the family down to the middle of the nineteenth century.

Other recent accessions of the Society include: a large group of Bonaparte papers, 1783-1871; a collection of Virdin papers, 1850-1938, dealing mainly with family estates; a group of letters to Charles M. Eaton on cultural subjects, 1845-1867; business papers of William E. Mayhew and Company, Baltimore merchants, 1817-1857; a manuscript journal of Major Ambrose R. H. Ranson, C.S.A., February-April, 1862; papers of Dr. John Boyd, of Baltimore, 1782-1783; family correspondence of John Campbell, Henry M. Morfit, and Campbell Morfit, 1815-1839; two volumes of account books of the Sheppard family, of Hancock, 1816-1896; cash books, bill books, and letterpress book of George Law Harrison, 1853-1881; the roll and minute book of the 53rd Regiment,

Maryland Volunteer Infantry, 1855-1861; and miscellaneous account books, minutes of early fire companies, and personal letters.

The archives of the Tennessee Historical Society recently received through bequest the papers and correspondence of John S. Claybrooke, covering almost a century of Tennessee history. Claybrooke was a nephew of Judge John Overton, whose business and personal associations with Andrew Jackson were unusually close, and was the administrator of Overton's estate. Included in the collection is a file of correspondence relating to the early history of Memphis; letters and documents signed by Jackson, John Sevier, James Robertson, and others; correspondence on the organization and early history of the Tennessee and Alabama Railroad Company, of which Claybrooke was the first president; and papers relating to plantation operations both before and after the Civil War.

Recent accessions of manuscripts by the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University include the following: New Orleans city records, 1765-1872, consisting of reports of Spanish officials, correspondence of the mayor and other city officials, resolutions and regulations of the city council, and city accounts and contracts; a collection of miscellaneous papers of William Bond, of Tangipahoa, Louisiana, 1842-1897; documents relating to the Sebastopol Plantation, St. Bernard Parish, 1858-1859; slavery documents, 1833-1861; papers of John W. Gurley, a New Orleans attorney, 1858-1866; a collection of personal papers of David J. Fluker, of New Orleans, and Captain J. L. Bradford, of the Confederate Army, covering the period from 1839 to 1867; diary of a trip from New Orleans to St. Louis in 1836, by Carlos Dehault de Lassus, a former governor of St. Louis; a farm diary of J. M. Gould, of Hammond, Louisiana, for the year 1888; family letters and documents, business papers, and account books of Richard L. Pugh, of Thibodaux, Louisiana, 1845-1900; personal letters, receipts, and sugar sales of the Landry family, of Assumption Parish, 1837-1900; Bradford family papers, 1798-1882, including official land surveys, sales, and other records of interests in East Feliciana Parish; and an inventory, dated August, 1812, of the property and slaves of La Reunion Plantation.

The Biennial Report of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, July 1, 1943, through June 30, 1945 (Jackson, 1945, pp. 30), prepared by Charlotte Capers, acting director, presents a detailed account of the services rendered by the Department in aiding research workers and in the acquisition of manuscript and newspaper materials which have a bearing on Mississippi history.

Iron Works at Tuball: Terms and Conditions for Their Lease as Stated by Alexander Spotswood on the Twentieth Day of July, 1739 (Charlottesville, Tracy W. McGregor Library, 1945, pp. 22, map and bibliographical note), with a historical introduction by Lester J. Cappon, is a facsimile reproduction of a

manuscript in Spotswood's handwriting which provides important information on the condition of mining and manufacturing interests in colonial Virginia. The historical introduction presents an excellent survey of the relation between Spotswood's private enterprise and his work as a British colonial official during the period from 1710 to 1740; and the contemporary map of Virginia (1738) places the venture in its geographic setting.

Texas: An Informal Biography (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1945, pp. x, 268, illustrations, \$3.50), by Owen P. White, is the product of a belief that any story of Texas "should be in the nature of a cheerful, informal biography," rather than as history. Starting with the assertion that the historians, "as if in collusion with one another, have unanimously inflated certain classical heroes to gigantic sizes entirely out of proportion to their achievements," the author proceeds to a cynical deflation of individuals and a reassessment of interests by emphasizing certain qualities and traditions out of all proportion to their importance. By means of an interesting combination of half-truths, misinformation, and at times a complete disregard of established facts, he manages to create the impression of a people who are apparently too insincere and inconsistent to solve their problems intelligently achieving in some unexplainable way the establishment of what he calls a great state. Whether he is laughing at the Texans, or with them, is not always clear; but in either case he has furnished material for an evening of entertaining reading which definitely is not history.

Lay My Burden Down: A Folk History of Slavery (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1945, pp. xxii, 286, illustrations, \$3.50), edited by Benjamin A. Botkin, is "a selection and integration of excerpts and complete narratives from the Slave Narrative Collection of the Federal Writers' Project." This particular collection, consisting of more than two thousand narratives, is the product of a project carried on in 1936 and 1937 under the Works Progress Administration "to study the needs and collect the testimony of ex-slaves." Mr. Botkin and his staff, interested primarily in folklore, have selected approximately three hundred narratives for presentation in this volume as a means of showing "the flavor of the entire collection and the social patterns revealed in the series." They believe, also, that in addition to the value of these narratives for the sociologist and the social anthropologist, they may be considered as "history from the bottom up, in which the people become their own historians," and thus directly concern the cultural historian. Unfortunately, however, the standards of historical criticism were by no means a major consideration in determining the material to be included, and many of the narratives are damaged by internal contradictions and inconsistencies, obvious errors of historical fact, and reliance on hearsay rather than first-hand experience, as the editor himself frankly admits. More serious than this from the point of view of the

historian is the fact that seventy-two years had elapsed between the close of the Civil War and the taking of this testimony; and his confidence in the dependability of the material for historical purposes is further undermined by the significant fact that of the 258 cases where the age of the narrator was known, 18 were born after 1864; 21 were born during the war; and 72 others were under ten years of age at the close of the war. This leaves 147 who might be considered old enough to have recollections of life in slavery. Furthermore, this information does not appear in connection with the narratives themselves, but has to be gleaned from the fine print at the end of the book, to which no reference is made in the text.

1828 Catalogue of the Library of the University of Virginia (Charlottesville, Alderman Library, 1945, pp. vi, 114, cloth binding, \$2.00, unbound, \$1.50), with an introduction by William Harwood Peden, is a facsimile reproduction of the list prepared by Thomas Jefferson in 1824 and revised and printed after his death by the faculty of the University. The list itself is of particular interest because of the light which it throws upon the contents and methods of classification of a scholarly library of a century ago; but equally interesting and important is Mr. Peden's introductory essay, which presents an illuminating discussion not only of those two subjects but also of the vicissitudes of building and preserving a library collection in the early years of the Republic.

The third volume of *The United States, 1865-1890: A Survey of Current Literature with Abstracts of Unpublished Dissertations* (Fremont, Ohio, The Rutherford B. Hayes-Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation, 1945, pp. viii, 304, \$1.00), edited by Curtis W. Garrison, covers the output during the year 1944 of books and articles dealing with life in the United States in the quarter century following the close of the Civil War. As in the earlier volumes, a conscious effort is made to present appraisals rather than reviews, and while the progress in that direction is definitely noticeable, the editor himself admits that there is still room for improvement. In addition to the difficulty of obtaining agreement on the question of what constitutes a contribution to knowledge the staff is apparently struggling with the task of evaluating in terms of relative rank instead of merely appraising individual items. That this is a dangerous procedure hardly needs to be pointed out here, because specialists will naturally show a predilection for contributions in their own field and the resulting evaluation is too likely to become subjective. In fact, there are numerous signs of such subjective judgment in this volume, and greater care needs to be taken in future volumes to present evaluations on the basis of composite rather than individual opinion. On the other hand, the publication is of incalculable value as a record of the literature appearing in a given year on one brief period of American history, and as such it deserves to be continued.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Port Tobacco, Lost Town of Maryland," by Ethel R. Hayden, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (December).
- "A People at War: Hagerstown, Maryland, June 15-August 31, 1863," by Fletcher M. Green, *ibid.*
- "Discovery of the Chesapeake Bay, 1525-1573," by Louis D. Scisco, *ibid.*
- "Politics in Maryland during the Civil War; Slavery and Emancipation in Maryland, 1861-1865," continued, by Charles B. Clark, *ibid.*
- "Maryland's First Papermaker," by Dieter Cunz, in the *American-German Review* (October).
- "Samuel Mordecai: Chronicler of Richmond, 1786-1865," by Alexander W. Weddell, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (October).
- "The Colonial Churches of New Kent and Hanover Counties, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, *ibid.*
- "Parson Sclater and His Vestry," by G. MacLaren Brydon, *ibid.*
- "The John Marshall Packet-Boat; The Queen of the James River and Kanawha Canal," by Catharine D. Horsley, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "Bath Iron Works," by E. P. Tomkins, *ibid.*
- "Thomas Jefferson—Founder of Modern American Agriculture," by Claude R. Wickard, in *Agricultural History* (July).
- "Monticello: An Experimental Farm," by James E. Ward, *ibid.*
- "Jefferson's Gardens at Monticello," by Edwin M. Betts, *ibid.*
- "Thomas Jefferson Survives," by Carl R. Woodward, *ibid.*
- "Reconstruction in West Virginia," continued, by Milton Gerofsky, in *West Virginia History* (October).
- "White unto Harvest," by Hubert McNeill Poteat, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "The History of the Eastern Carolina Industrial Training School for Boys, Rocky Mount, North Carolina," by Samuel E. Leonard, *ibid.*
- "Eighteenth Century New Bern: A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800," Parts III and IV, by Alonzo Thomas Dill, Jr., *ibid.* (July-October).
- "The Salt Supply of North Carolina during the American Revolution," by Robert L. Hilldrup, *ibid.* (October).
- "North Carolinians in Illinois History," by Jay Monaghan, *ibid.*
- "'Enthusiasm' in Carolina, 1740," by Andrew T. Nelson, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).
- "The Admission of Tennessee into the Union," by Samuel C. Williams, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "The Political Satires of George W. Harris," by Donald Day, *ibid.*

- "The Country Store in Post-Civil War Tennessee," by Thomas D. Clark, in the *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* (1945).
- "Blount College and East Tennessee College, 1794-1840: The First Predecessors of the University of Tennessee," by Stanley J. Folmsbee, *ibid.*
- "George Roulstone: Father of the Tennessee Press," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*
- "The Religious Views of Andrew Jackson," by Arda Walker, *ibid.*
- "Adolph S. Ochs: The Boy Publisher," by Gilbert E. Govan and James W. Livingood, *ibid.*
- "One Hundred Years of a Female Academy: The Knoxville Female Academy, 1811-1846; The East Tennessee Female Institute, 1846-1911," by Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*
- "'Grant's Station' and Bryan Station-Blue Licks Road," by C. Frank Dunn, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "Notes on the Discovery of a Faulted Area in Northern-Central Kentucky," by Willard Rouse Jillson, *ibid.*
- "Early Kentucky History in Madison County Circuit Court Records, and Colonel William Harris Caperton's Account of Estill's Defeat," continued, by Jonathan T. Dorris, *ibid.*
- "Captain Joseph Allen," by Mary Allen Goodson, *ibid.*
- "The Contributions of Governor Shelby and the People of Kentucky to the Freedom of Michigan in the War of 1812," by Carl E. Pray, Jr., in *Michigan History* (October).
- "Charles Wilkins Short, 1794-1863, Botanist and Physician," concluded, by P. Albert Davies, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).
- "The Assassination of General William Nelson, September 29, 1862, and Its Ramifications," by Hambleton Tapp, *ibid.*
- "Contribution of the State Historical Society of Missouri to the Constitutional Convention," by Allen McReynolds, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (October).
- "Negro Education in Ante-Bellum Missouri," by R. I. Brigham, in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "Pioneer Indian Agriculture in Oklahoma," by Norman A. Graebner, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Autumn).
- "Origin of Oklahoma Day," by Muriel H. Wright, *ibid.*
- "The Abortive Territory of Cimarron," by Oscar A. Kinchen, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "An Autobiographical Application for Employment, 1788," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (October).
- "Three War Letters," edited by Rosamond Randall Beirne, in the *Maryland Historical Quarterly* (December).

- "James Madison, Executor of the Estate of John Moore," contributed by Mrs. William Montgomery Sweeny, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, edited by George H. S. King, *ibid.*
- "The Minutes of the Greenbrier Baptist Church, 1781-1832," edited by Emma Frances Alderson, in *West Virginia History* (October).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, *ibid.*
- "Life of Alfred Mordecai in Mexico in 1865-1866, as Told in His Letters to His Family," Parts II and III, edited by James A. Padgett, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July-October).
- "Letters of a Confederate Surgeon in the Army of Tennessee," edited by Enoch L. Mitchell, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1810," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "Up the Tennessee in 1790: The Report of Major John Doughty to the Secretary of War," edited by Colton Storm, in the *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* (1945).
- "Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to Tennessee and the Old Southwest, 1783-1800," continued, edited by Duvon C. Corbitt and Roberta Corbitt, *ibid.*
- "Writings on Tennessee History, 1944," compiled by Martha L. Ellison, *ibid.*
- "Some Old Kentucky Wills," contributed by Margaret Carlock Harris, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "The Road West in 1818; The Diary of Henry Vest Bingham," Part I, edited by Marie George Windell, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (October).
- "The Missouri Reader: The French in the Valley," edited by Dorothy Penn, *ibid.*
- "Reminiscences of Pioneer Days," by L. P. Bobo, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Autumn).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "The South Carolina Dispensary System," continued, by Ellen Alexander Hendricks, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "The Christian Commonwealth in Georgia," by Ralph Albertson, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "The Democratic Pre-Convention Campaign of 1912 in Georgia," by Arthur S. Link, *ibid.*
- "The Florida Banditti, 1783," by Joseph B. Lockey, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Pioneer Florida: An Interpretation of Spanish Laws and Land Titles," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*

- "The Elisha F. King Family, Planters of the Alabama Black Belt," by Weymouth T. Jordan, in *Agricultural History* (July).
- "Colonial Natchez: The Early British Period," by Clinton N. Howard, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).
- "An Appraisal of J. F. H. Claiborne, with His Annotated 'Memoranda,'" by William B. Hamilton and Ruth K. Nuernberger, *ibid.*
- "The Neutral Ground between Louisiana and Texas, 1806-1821," by J. Villisana Haggard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "The Political Career of Murphy James Foster, Governor of Louisiana, 1892-1900," by Sidney J. Romero, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Old and New Capitols of Arkansas," by Clara B. Eno, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Autumn).
- "The Political Career of John L. Williamson," by Gladys Powell, *ibid.*
- "George Wesley Droke: Teacher and Civic Leader," by Virgil L. Jones, *ibid.*
- "Oil and Gas in Southwest Arkansas," by Glen Martel, *ibid.*
- "The Spelling and Pronunciation of Arkansas," by Fred R. Bryson, *ibid.*
- "Three Arkansas Travelers," by Robert L. Morris, *ibid.*
- "Andrew Hunter, Pioneer Methodist (1813-1902)," by Mrs. F. M. Williams, *ibid.*
- "When Arkansas Had Its First Thanksgiving Day," by Diana Sherwood, *ibid.*
- "The Marquis of San Miguel de Aguayo and His Recovery of Texas from the French, 1719-1723," by Charles W. Hackett, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "David Gouverneur Burnet," by Dorothy Louise Fields, *ibid.*
- "The Mormon Migration into Texas," by C. Stanley Banks, *ibid.*
- "Notes on Early Steamboating on the Rio Grande," by Harbert Davenport, *ibid.*
- "The Election of Jefferson Davis to the Presidency of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas," by Charles F. Arrowood, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Letters of a Confederate Surgeon: Dr. Abner Embry McGarity, 1862-1865," continued, edited by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Tallahassee and St. Marks in 1841; A Letter of John S. Tappan," edited by William T. Cash, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "A Diary of Joshua Nichols Glenn; St. Augustine in 1823," *ibid.*
- "Revolutionary Soldiers in Alabama," in the *Alabama Historical Quarterly* (Winter).
- "An Overlooked Source for Mississippi Local History: The Spirit of Missions, 1836-1854," edited by Nash K. Burger, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).

- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, May, 1785," continued, edited by Laura L. Porteous, with marginal notes by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Contemporary Newspaper Accounts of the Annexation of Texas," edited by Llerena Friend, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by Ernest W. Winkler, *ibid.*
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "The Griswold Story of Freneau and Jefferson," by Philip Marsh, in the *American Historical Review* (October).
- "The Indentured Servant in Colonial America," by Katharine L. Biehl, in *Social Studies* (November).
- "Dr. Thomas Bray's Commissary Work in London, 1696-1699," by Samuel C. McCulloch, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (October).
- "Some Genial Old Drinking Customs," by Marie Kimball, *ibid.*
- "The Yale University Library: Its Early American Collections," by James T. Babb, *ibid.*
- "The Influence of Princeton on Higher Education in the South before 1825," by Donald R. Come, *ibid.*
- "The English Campaign for Abolition of the Slave Trade," by Louis T. Merrill, in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "Thomas Pownall and His Negro Commonwealth," by John A. Schutz, *ibid.*
- "Living Agricultural Museums," by Herbert A. Kellar, in *Agricultural History* (July).
- "The Origin of the Land Speculator as a Frontier Type," by Ray A. Billington, *ibid.* (October).
- "The Agricultural History Society's First Quarter Century," by Arthur C. Peterson, *ibid.*
- "The Influence of Woodrow Wilson on Frederick Jackson Turner," by Wendell H. Stephenson, *ibid.*
- "Myth-Makers and the South's Dilemma," by Louis B. Wright, in the *Sewanee Review* (October).

CONTRIBUTORS

FLETCHER M. GREEN, president of the Southern Historical Association in 1945, is Kenan professor of history at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

THOMAS D. CLARK is professor of history and chairman of the department at the University of Kentucky.

THEODORE SALOUTOS is lecturer in history at the University of California at Los Angeles.

ALFRED J. HANNA is professor of history and director of inter-American studies at Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida.

JAMES W. PATTON is professor of history and chairman of the department at North Carolina State College, Raleigh.

ELIZABETH COMETTI is assistant professor of history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR., is associate professor of history at Stanford University.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JAMES FERGUSON KING

BOARD OF EDITORS

Arthur S. Aiton
Carlos E. Castañeda
Charles C. Griffin
Lewis Hanke
Roscoe R. Hill

Roland D. Hussey
James F. King
Irving A. Leonard
Arthur P. Whitaker

ADVISORY EDITORS

Herbert E. Bolton
Isaac J. Cox
Clarence H. Haring

Dana G. Munro
J. Fred Rippy
William S. Robertson

Editorial correspondence: PROFESSOR JAMES F. KING
ROOM 439, BANCROFT LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Business correspondence: DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLLEGE STATION
DURHAM, N. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The January, 1946, issue contains the following:

Virginia County Court Records: Their Background and Scope, by
Mrs. Philip W. Hiden.

The Earliest Known Church of Elizabeth City Parish, by George
Carrington Mason.

Captain John Martin of Brandon on the James, by James P. C.
Southall.

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;
Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00
Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE

The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

MERRILL M. JENSEN

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The William and Mary Quarterly

A Magazine of Early American History, Institutions, and Culture

A new series of the William and Mary College Quarterly
with a broadened field of interest

Published by the College of William and Mary

Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY
University of Virginia

RICHARD L. MORTON
College of William and Mary

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS
Clements Library

CURTIS P. NETTELS
Cornell University

JULIAN P. BOYD
Princeton University

STANLEY PARGELLIS
Newberry Library

VIRGINIUS DABNEY
Richmond Times-Dispatch

JOHN E. POMFRET
College of William and Mary

DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN
Richmond News Leader

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
Harvard University

LEONARD W. LABAREE
Yale University

EARL G. SWEM
College of William and Mary

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON
Harvard University

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER
Princeton University

LOUIS B. WRIGHT, Huntington Library

Managing Editor RICHARD L. MORTON, College of William and Mary

Subscription rates: \$4.00 the calendar year, \$1.00 a copy

Correspondence relating to the

William and Mary Quarterly should be addressed to the Managing Editor,
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;
Contributing, \$10.00; Life, a sum in dollars equal to 100 less
age of applicant.

Editor:
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Complete back files of **THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY**

Including title page and index for each volume
may be obtained at \$3.00 per volume

Single numbers can be supplied at 75 cents each

SEND ORDERS TO

JAMES W. PATTON, *Secretary-Treasurer*

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in **THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY**

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

VICE-PRESIDENT

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, University of Kentucky (1947)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1948)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, JR., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)

J. HAROLD EASTERBY, College of Charleston (1948)

DANIEL M. ROBISON, Vanderbilt University (1948)
